Valery Deyev

Philosophy and Social Theory: an Introduction to Historical Materialism

Progress Publishers

Valery Deyev, Cand. Sc. (Philosophy) and author of a number of scientific works, specialises in the history of philosophy and sociology, and in the present-day social thought of Europe and America. For this book, Valery Deyev has been awarded a special diploma by Progress Publishers.

Valery Deyev

Philosophy and Social Theory: an Introduction to Historical Materialism

Progress Publishers

Moscow

GUIDES TO SOCIAL SCIENCES

Translated from the Russian by **Galina Sdobnikova**

Designed by *Nikolai Senko*

В. А. Деев

ФИЛОСОФИЯ И СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ТЕОРИЯ:
ВВЕДЕНИЕ В ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ
МАТЕРИАЛИЗМ

На английском языке

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1987
English translation © Progress Publishers 1987

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Д $\frac{0302020200-573}{014(01)-87}$ 11—87

CONTENTS

To the Reader 5

Chapter One. PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL COGNITION . . 6

1. World Outlook. Philosophy. Social Theory 6
2. Historical Materialism: Its Subject-Matter Defined . . . 12
3. The Basic Problems of Social Theory 16
4. Dialectics and Social Cognition 17
5. Basic Categories and Concepts 22
6. Historical Materialism and the Social Sciences 26

Chapter Two. THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST SOCIAL THEORY 29

1. Theoretical Sources 29
2. Historical and Social Conditions 34
3. The Founders of the Materialist Theory of Social Development 36

Chapter Three. THE SOCIETY AND HISTORY 50

1. Nature and the Society 50
2. Production 58
3. Socio-Economic Formation 66
4. History: Diversity and Unity 75
5. The Motive Forces of History 85
6. Historical Forms of Community 99

Chapter Four. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE 109

1. The Social Structure: The Concept Defined 109
2. Classes and the Social Structure 111
3. Socialism: Towards a New Type of Social Structure . . . 117

Chapter Five. THE SOCIETY AND POLITICS 121

1. Politics. Classes. The State 121
2. Present-Day Capitalism: the Society and Politics 127
3. The Class Struggle and Revolution 129
4. Socialism and Democracy 133

Chapter Six. SOCIAL REVOLUTION 136

1. Social Revolution: Essence and Prerequisites 136
2. Revolutionary Situation 139
3. The Character and Motive Forces of Revolutions 140

Chapter Seven. THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE 143

1. Culture: The Concept Defined 143
2. Culture and Civilisation 148
3. Transformation of the Society and Culture 151

Chapter Eight. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS 156

1. Social Consciousness: Its Structure and Essence 156
2. Independence of Social Consciousness. Its Role in Social Development 160
3. The Forms of Social Consciousness 163

Conclusion 174

Glossary: Key Concepts of Marxist Philosophy and Social Theory 176

To the Reader

This book is an extended introduction to the basic problems of Marxist social theory, or historical materialism.

Chapter One deals with the general philosophical and sociological principles, categories and concepts of that theory; Chapter Two, with its history, and subsequent chapters, with the formulation and solution within its framework of the key problems of social cognition.

Such a presentation, first, makes it easier and more convenient for the beginner to study Marxist social theory on one's own and, second, enables those who already have some idea of that theory from various sources to systematise, supplement and deepen their knowledge in the right direction.

The glossary of terms and concepts used in Marxist philosophical and sociological literature has been compiled with a view to the knowledge each of these categories of readers may want to obtain.

Special attention is paid in the book to the topical aspects of the problems considered, their connection with our day, the continuity of their solution within the framework of Marxist tradition, and the importance of the main propositions and conclusions of Marxist social theory for practical social transformations in the present period.

Chapter One
PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL COGNITION

1. WORLD OUTLOOK. PHILOSOPHY. SOCIAL THEORY

The social theory of Marxism, or *historical materialism,* is an integral element of Marxist philosophy. It emerged and has been developing together with *dialectical materialism* as a part of the scientific materialist *world outlook.*

World outlook is a system of views on the world as a whole (nature, the society and thought), which determine and direct man's theoretical and practical activity. It is made up of all the ideas, opinions, ideals and principles which are formed in people's minds in the process of their social, practical activity. The experience of the particular sciences and various ethical, political, legal, religious and aesthetic views and principles play a major role in shaping the world outlook.

Philosophy has a special place in that process. In our day, it plays the leading role in forming the world outlook, for philosophy itself is a system of the more general ideas about the world and man's place in it. Philosophy is both an instrument and a specific result of man's theoretical and practical mastery of the surrounding reality. That is why it is the theoretical basis of the world outlook.

Each individual's view of the world, his perception and understanding of reality do not exist on their own, but depend on the experience in mastering the world which the individual acquires, stores and passes on to other people in the process of his practical activity, his social practice. So, the source of that experience and knowledge about the world is *practice,* i.e., human material activity *whose purpose is to change and transform nature and the society.* That activity embraces all aspects of joint human life: the production and distribution of material values, ideological and political relations, art, morality and science. In

their practical activity, people create spiritual culture, as well as definite material values.

Man's cognitive activity and its results are an organic part of practice. Without cognition and thinking, human practice would have been simply impossible. As a result of human cognitive activity aimed at transforming nature and the society, spiritual culture in definite forms (including material objects and monuments, such as manuscripts, books, pictures, sculptures, blueprints, music scores, films, records, photographs and computer softwear, which contain definite ideas, social norms, etc.) records, stores and passes on from epoch to epoch and from generation to generation the achievements connected with that activity.

People's knowledge about the world they live in is an integral part of these achievements, which are an embodiment of the society's cultural level.

Knowledge is the result of man's cognitive activity, a reflection of objective reality in his consciousness. In form, direction and content, practical and theoretical cognitive activity is highly diverse. The forms of existence of the results of that activity, or knowledge, are equally diverse.

Knowledge exists in various forms: *everyday,* or conventional ("practical") knowledge, which is oriented towards day-to-day human behaviour and is connected with the individual's life experience; *empirical* (drawn from observation, description, etc.) and *theoretical* (obtained through generalisation, hypothesis and systematisation of empirical knowledge) *scientific knowledge,* which is true and logically noncontradictory and which is the main guide in the cognitive process, enabling people to foresee the tendencies of changes in reality, of its purposeful transformation; and *other forms of knowledge,* which are relatively independent of conventional and scientific knowledge: mythological, religious, artistic, technical, etc.

Each form of knowledge has its specific reflection in the collective human consciousness, primarily in collective human psychology, where this knowledge is recorded.

Knowledge is the result of the cognitive process, its socially meaningful experience, tested by social practice and objective logic. In man's cognition, that experience is reflected in the form of definite notions, concepts, ideas, judgements and theories. As

people cognise the world and its realities, they develop convictions. These are firm and assured views and notions, tested by the experience of many people (often whole generations), deeply rooted in their consciousness, and guiding them in their practical activity.

So, in cognising the world, people acquire definite knowledge, which serves them in their daily life. Human knowledge about the world is just as diverse as the world itself. There is a complex interconnection between knowledge, the cognitive process and actual reality.

Depending on the forms of the existence of knowledge about the world in the human consciousness, and also on the objective, socio-historical conditions which determine that knowledge, different types of world perception take shape and different systems of world outlook develop. All people have a world outlook, but with some it takes shape spontaneously (everyday world outlook), with others it assumes the form of faith and worship (religious world outlook), and still others cultivate it deliberately, trying to understand social life and their own attitude to the world by studying past socio-historical experience, various particular sciences and philosophy.

The main distinction between the conventional, religious and philosophical systems of world outlook lies in the *picture of the world* projected by each of these on the strength of its own understanding of the world, man and the society. In spite of all the distinctions between them, they also have something in common, embracing the more general questions. Among these are the questions of the correlation between spirit (idea) and matter (reality), of what is man, what is his place in the world, whether he can cognise reality and, if he can, how does he do that, how can man attain happiness, what is the meaning of good and evil, what is the purpose of life, why does the human society develop and what are the laws of its development.

The conventional world outlook answers these and other related questions on the strength of people's everyday experience, which is fragmentary and often contradictory and incomplete.

The religious world outlook is based on an illusory, fantastic reflection of the world in people's minds, in their notions about life, their ideals and convictions. It implies a distorted and untrue picture of the world and of man's place in it.

As compared with these two systems of world outlook, philosophy is a relatively integral system of the more general theoretical views of the world: nature, the society and man.

As the most general theoretical world outlook, philosophy formulates and answers each of the more general questions of cognition in accordance with the answer it gives to the *fundamental question: the question concerning the relation of consciousness to being, of the spiritual to the material.* The answer given to the fundamental question of philosophy and cognition as a whole is of exceptional importance both for philosophy itself and for any of the scientific disciplines for which it provides the world-outlook (general theoretical) orientation. Depending on how that question is answered within the framework of this or that philosophical conception, the resultant world outlook will serve as either a true or a false guide in human cognition and activity.

That is why any system of world outlook is primarily determined by how it formulates and answers the question of the relation of thought to being, of the spiritual to the material, of the subjective to the objective. The history of world philosophy is highly instructive: it shows that the way in which outstanding thinkers of the past formulated and answered that question determined their world-outlook, cognitive and ideological orientations and conclusions.

Depending on the answer to the fundamental question of philosophy (what is primary: nature or spirit, matter or consciousness; which of these has been engendered by the other: consciousness by the objective material world or vice versa; and what is the relation between knowledge about the world and the world itself, that is, between consciousness and being), philosophy projects either a *materialist* or an *idealist* world outlook as the two main philosophical trends. Throughout the history of philosophy, the materialist world outlook has developed in a struggle against idealism.

Materialist orientations in philosophy have in one way or another always seen nature and the actually existing material world with its diverse manifestations as the basic element, and spirit and consciousness only as its derivatives, while idealist philosophy has assumed the primacy of spirit over matter, regarding consciousness as the "prime cause" of the world.

Evidently, *idealism is antithetical to materialism in answering the basic question of philosophy.* It absolutises the spirit, its "independence" of reality itself, separating consciousness from the objective material world.

The main trends of philosophical idealism (primarily, *objective idealism*, whose advocates, like Hegel, are in quest of a universal spirit, a supra-individual consciousness, and *subjective idealism*, whose advocates reduce all knowledge about the world to the content of individual consciousness) divert cognition in one degree or another from the scientific truth, although some of them (like phenomenological orientations, critical rationalism, etc.) claim to be in quest of it. That quest, however, is carried on from positions of irrationalism and agnosticism, something that gives philosophy religious overtones and is thus incompatible with scientific cognition.

Materialism is closely connected with the dialectical conception of the world. Its history has known the naive (spontaneous) materialism of antiquity, pre-Marxist and Marxist materialism. The first was combined with equally naive dialectics, with doctrines of primitive material elements constituting the universe: water, air, fire, etc. Pre-Marxist materialism, which emerged with the formation of capitalist social relations and reached its peak in French materialism, was mechanistic (subordinating the world to the laws of mechanics); it denied any qualitative distinctions in nature and recognised only quantitative ones.

Marxist materialism as a unity of dialectical and historical materialism is a truly scientific form of materialism, being the most integral, consistent and comprehensive of all materialist doctrines. It was created by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, who formulated the basic propositions of the scientific world outlook. It presents the world as a reality given to man, objectively reflected in his consciousness and transformed through purposeful social practice.

In elaborating the principles of the dialectico-materialist world outlook, Marx and Engels showed that what divides all philosophers into idealists and materialists is how they answer the fundamental question of philosophy, and that the struggle between these two camps in philosophy is a specific reflection of the contest between the basic vital interests of progressive (materialism) and reactionary (idealism) social forces.

As they elaborated the basic philosophical principles of the new world outlook, Marx and Engels made a critical review of all the achievements of earlier materialism and dialectics, the conclusions of natural science and social thought. That enabled them to sum up the results of scientific cognition as a whole, to see it as part of the experience gained by mankind in its historical practice, substantiating the latter's decisive role in the development of human cognition and showing its unity with the progressive, revolutionary theory that contained a new understanding of social history and its progressive development.

So, as Marx and Engels elaborated their dialectico-materialist world outlook, they also revolutionised mankind's view of the society. By substantiating the materialist understanding of history, the sources and motive forces of social development, Marx and Engels laid the foundations of a truly scientific social theory. The social theory of Marxism—historical materialism—made it possible to deepen and specify the main laws and propositions of materialist dialectics, and to give a consistently scientific, materialist explanation of the basic prerequisites of history and the laws and conditions of social development.

Later on, we shall return to the significance of the revolution in social cognition effected by Marx and Engels as they created historical materialism. Let us merely note here that its emergence was closely tied in with their development of the basic principles of the scientific materialist world outlook, a world outlook which enabled its founders not only to see mankind's past in a new light, but also to make scientific forecasts for the society of the future, to project the main lines of its development, lay the foundations and formulate the pivotal propositions of the theory of scientific socialism and communism.

The basic principles of the world outlook founded by Marx and Engels and their theoretical legacy as a whole were subsequently elaborated by Vladimir Lenin, another great revolutionary thinker. Enriched by Lenin's scientifically substantiated conclusions on the development laws of progressive scientific theory and by the practice of the society's revolutionary transformation in our epoch, this world outlook—Marxism-Leninism, which expresses the interests of the proletariat, the most progressive class of the present-day society—is a time-tested and reliable compass in its struggle against economic, social and all other forms

of exploitation and oppression, for mankind's better future.

As a part of that advanced world outlook, Marxist social theory answers the key questions raised by the practice of struggle for a revolutionary renewal of the society.

World outlook, philosophy, social cognition and social practice are closely interconnected. Summing up that interconnection, one could say that:

—as the most general system of views on the world (nature, the society, man, the laws of thought and cognition), philosophy is a definite theoretical, i.e., theoretically substantiated, world outlook;

—the philosophy of Marx, Engels and Lenin is the scientific system of such a world outlook;

—alongside dialectical materialism, which explains the more general development laws of nature, the society and thought, this philosophy also includes within its system of views a scientific materialist understanding of history, the basic laws and motive forces of social development;

—that scientific materialist understanding of social history lies at the root of *historical materialism*;

—dialectical and historical materialism are in organic unity, because they are both parts of the integral scientific materialist world outlook and are a theoretical generalising result of mankind's cognition of the world and its main laws;

—as the social theory of Marxism, historical materialism is a reliable world-outlook guide in the practical revolutionary transformation of the human society.

2. HISTORICAL MATERIALISM: ITS SUBJECT-MATTER DEFINED

Every science has its own subject-matter. The *subject-matter* of a science is the area, the sphere of reality studied by that science from its own, peculiar angle. In examining its subject-matter, any science seeks to discern and explain the uniformities, processes and phenomena of reality, bringing them out step by step.

Science gives a theoretical systematisation of the objective knowledge about reality with a view to obtaining new knowledge, which has a definite practical (as well as theoretical) importance, for science is closely connected with man's practical mastery of the world.

One of the conditions for identifying different subject-matter spheres and demarcating these in the particular sciences is the specialisation of scientists' research interests. Stemming from the objective needs of human practice, such specialisation of research manifests itself in demarcating the spheres of scientific interests both between different sciences (natural, which study various aspects of the natural world, like biology, physics, or chemistry, and social, each of which examines this or that sphere of social life from its own angle) and within the framework of one scientific discipline.

Take history. As a science of mankind's past, history is subdivided into ancient, medieval, modern and recent. The complex of its branches includes economic history, military history, historiography (the history of history), etc. Then there is also the history of individual countries and peoples, of various aspects of culture, science, technology and art. So, the subject-matter orientations of the various branches of history as a science are highly diverse. At the same time, that does not rule out the integrity of that science, which studies the integral, though diverse, experience of mankind's development in its concrete manifestations.

Since social life is so complicated and diverse, the subject-matter orientations of the various social sciences that study it do not coincide. Each of these investigates its own area of real life known as the society: demography deals with the laws of population; sociology, with social relations and the laws of the society's functioning and development; economics, with the laws of its economic life and human economic activity; jurisprudence, with juridical institutions and with legal views and relations sanctioned by the state as laws, norms of social life, etc.

But alongside the specific uniformities of social development, studied by the particular social sciences, there is also a set of the more general laws, and these constitute the subject-matter of historical materialism, which is the most general theoretico-cognitive compass in social cognition as a whole, a scientific methodology for the study of the society and its history by various scientific disciplines.

Relying on dialectical materialism, or the science of the more general laws of the development of objective reality and cognition, historical materialism studies the society, seeking to explain the laws of its functioning and development.

The subject-matter of historical materialism is a study of the general laws and motive forces in the development of the human society.

What is the society? How and why does it develop? What is the cause of its progress from one epoch to another? Wherein lie the roots of the radical changes taking place in the society, and what is their specifics?

Marxist social theory, or historical materialism, formulates and gives a scientifically substantiated answer to each of these and other related questions. Pre-Marxist social thought also tried to answer some of these questions, but without much success: since it was idealist, it could not explain from a scientific stand the objectively existing conditions and prerequisites of human life in the society, the laws of its history.

That was done by Marx and Engels, who exposed the speculative, conjectural nature of the idealist view of history. They showed that the dialectico-materialist answer to the fundamental question of philosophy in application to social development—that of the relation of social being to social consciousness—is the only scientific answer to that question in social cognition. The cornerstone of historical materialism was laid by an idea formulated by Marx in his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*: "The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness."[1]

A consistently materialist answer to the fundamental question of philosophy in application to social cognition enabled Marx to see the *objective basis* of history and the society as a reflection of the realities of social life in human consciousness.

Marxist social theory or historical materialism, regards the society as an objectively existing reality, as the sum-total of the relations and conditions of joint human life, a peculiar social organism that lives and develops according to its own, intrinsic laws, which cannot be reduced to the laws of nature or, moreover, derived from the spiritual "state of the epoch", from the collective consciousness.

[1] Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 20-21.

The view of the society offered by Marxist social theory refutes any naturalistic (likening the society to the natural world) or subjectivist (reducing social relations to an interplay of individual consciousnesses) explanations of social reality, which are on the whole accepted by present-day non-Marxist trends in philosophy and sociology. In a bid to play down the importance of historical materialism for social cognition and to distort the main propositions and conclusions of Marxist social theory, its present-day critics prefer to describe its approach to social research as merely an attempt by its founders to combine in an "arbitrary" way some propositions of earlier materialism with Hegel's dialectics and with conclusions drawn from the doctrines of the utopian socialists, a synthesis which has allegedly not yielded any complete philosophical system.

In answering such critics of Marxist social theory and showing the close interconnection of its main propositions and conclusions with the integral dialectico-materialist world outlook, Lenin wrote: "Marx deepened and developed philosophical materialism to the full, and extended the cognition of nature to include the cognition of *human society*."[1] Marx's historical materialism was a great scientific breakthrough. "The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics," Lenin emphasised, "were replaced by a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory."[2]

So, let us draw some conclusions:

—historical materialism is an independent philosophical discipline, with its own special subject-matter;

—the subject-matter of historical materialism is the laws and motive forces of the development of the human society;

—historical materialism gives a consistently scientific explanation of the main laws and motive forces of social development.

To understand historical materialism, one should examine its key problems, categories and concepts, and that is what we shall proceed to do.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 25.

[2] *Ibid.*

3. THE BASIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL THEORY

As an independent theory, historical materialism took shape and was developed as a result of an in-depth comprehension of the major problems of social cognition by Marx and Engels, and then by Lenin.

In speaking of the fundamental distinction between Marxist social theory and all preceding theories of social development, Lenin pointed out two basic shortcomings of the latter: first, their limited idealistic conceptions of the society, the inability of bourgeois theorists to see the objective basis of social relations, rooted in the system of material production and its development laws; and second, the inability of these theorists to see that the real prerequisites for social change lie in the action of the masses. Historical materialism, Lenin said, eliminated these shortcomings and, "by examining the *totality* of opposing tendencies, by reducing them to precisely definable conditions of life and production of the various *classes* of society, by discarding subjectivism and arbitrariness in the choice of a particular 'dominant' idea or in its interpretation, and by revealing that, without exception, all ideas and all the various tendencies *stem* from the condition of the material forces of production, Marxism indicated the way to an all-embracing and comprehensive study of the process of the rise, development, and decline of socio-economic systems. People make their own history, but what determines the motives of people, of the mass of people, i.e., what gives rise to the clash of conflicting ideas and strivings? What is the sum total of all these clashes in the mass of human societies? What are the objective conditions of production of material life that form the basis of all of man's historical activity? What is the law of development of these conditions? To all these Marx drew attention and indicated the way to a scientific study of history as a single process which, with all its immense variety and contradictoriness, is governed by definite laws."[1]

Lenin's characterisation of historical materialism also helps to see the range of its basic problems. Among the most important of these are the problems of studying the society as: (1) a result of human activity; (2) a totality of the relations into which people enter in the process of producing the material values they

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, 1977, p. 57.

need for their existence and in the subsequent distribution of these products of their joint labour; (3) an integral social organism, with its own laws of functioning and development.

The key problems of Marxist social theory also include the problems of the society's social structure (as a totality of the relations that take shape in the sphere of the economic basis and the ideological, political and other superstructural relations "rising above" that basis and determined by economic relations); the motive forces of social development (primarily the problems of classes and class struggle); social revolution, its objective and subjective factors; explanation of history, its laws and motive forces, the content and essence of socio-historical progress; and the methodology of the cognition of social phenomena.

Marxist social theory also takes a great interest in problems relating to the interaction between the society and nature (including such urgent problems facing mankind in our day as conservation of the natural environment, the ecological crisis, population, etc.); the society's social organisation; its political life; the specific social content of the crucial components, forms and mechanisms of the social consciousness; the subject of the historical process (the place and role of the popular masses and individuals in the society's history, in the process of its transformation), etc.

There is a close dialectical interconnection between the basic problems of historical materialism.

4. DIALECTICS AND SOCIAL COGNITION

Relying on the laws of materialist dialectics, historical materialism studies the specific laws of social life—social laws—and gives their scientific explanation.

Every law expresses an objective, necessary and stable connection between processes and phenomena. Dialectical materialism makes it possible to see that connection in the more general laws governing the development of nature, the society and thought. Its laws not only bring out the *universal, essential relations* between natural and social phenomena, but also show their *qualitative peculiarity.* That connection and peculiarity are also reflected in social laws studied by historical materialism, the laws of social life and social development.

The specifics of social laws, just as the laws of the natural world, can be understood with the help of the laws of materialist dialectics. Its main laws, which provide reliable guidance in scientific cognition, social cognition in particular, include:

(1) *the law of the unity and struggle of opposites,* which pinpoints the source of independent development in the world surrounding man, shows the system of contradictions interconnecting various aspects of the ceaseless process of transition from some forms of being to others, with a resolution of these contradictions in the course of progressive development; expressing the essence, the very core of dialectics, this law also helps to explain the specific content of social contradictions, to bring out the interaction of various aspects of people's material production and spiritual activity, and to see the real prerequisites for social development, for the historical process;

(2) *the law of the transformation of quantity into quality* (and vice versa), which characterises development as a fundamental, internal, structural change of the phenomena being studied, the emergence of a new quality (or set of qualities) on the basis of definite quantitative changes in the course of development; it also shows the qualitative content of quantitative changes in the society connected with demographic processes, with changes in the numerical correlation and composition of definite social classes and strata in the social structure, with the development of material production, the spread of culture, and revolutionary transformations in any sphere of social life;

(3) *the law of the negation of the negation,* which sees development as a strictly *progressive process,* that is, it determines how and in what form are the connection and historical continuity effected in development, and how a positive quality attained at a definite stage asserts itself, negating the preceding initial state, something that becomes an element of ascent from the lower to the higher in the course of development, an element of the resolution of the internal contradictions of that process, which does not rule out but, on the contrary, presupposes their internal unity, their struggle as a struggle between the opposite sides of that unity; this law also helps to see and explain the continuity in the development of culture and the society, to present it as a movement effected through the negation (replacement) of some forms of human practice (activity and thought) by other

and higher forms, like the succession of forms of property, types of culture and whole civilisations in history; the evolution of ethical, political, religious and other views, or the development of science through a succession of theories, views and hypotheses.

Many critics of Marxism claim that historical materialism "naturalises" social cognition, "reducing" the content of its objective uniformities to the objective uniformities of nature and so "ignoring" the qualitative specifics of the society and its development laws.

Such views are primarily developed and expounded by representatives of anthropologically oriented trends, which have traditionally criticised Marxism from the positions of Freudianism, existentialism and "philosophical sociology" (Alfred Weber, Georg Simmel, José Ortega y Gasset). The present-day followers of these traditions continue to advocate views based on a misunderstanding of the scientific materialist explanation of natural and social laws, and sometimes on a poor knowledge of the problems of social cognition as formulated by the founders of historical materialism.

In showing the specifics of social uniformities, historical materialism does not reduce their explanation to abstract theoretical statements emphasising the "analogies" (as naturalistic interpretations do) or the "dissimilarities" and qualitative distinctions (as subjectivist interpretations do) between the laws of nature and the society. Regarding social development as a *natural historical process,* Marxist social theory shows the fundamental distinction of the laws of social life studied within its framework—as the laws of conscious and purposeful human activity—from the laws of motion and development in the natural world. That distinction, Marx emphasised, is primarily due to the fact that men make their own history, although "they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past".[1] Consciously changing these circumstances, people act in accordance with the objective conditions and laws of the society they live in.

The connection between materialist dialectics and historical

[1] Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 11, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 103.

materialism primarily manifests itself in that the latter could be seen as the dialectico-materialist method operating in the sphere of social cognition. The importance of that method as an instrument of social cognition is due not only to its theoretico-cognitive potentialities, but also to the practical social content of the conclusions and principles of materialist dialectics, their creative use in tackling the problems of social reconstruction, of radical social transformations.

Among the major principles of materialist dialectics (principle here means a definite demand by which one should be guided in the process of cognition), which were elaborated, in particular, by V. I. Lenin in application to the problems of historical materialism, are:

(1) *the principle of studying social phenomena in their interconnection and interdependence*; Lenin attached particular importance to that principle, emphasising in *The Collapse of the Second International* that "Marxist dialectics . . . excludes any isolated examination of an object, i.e., one that is one-sided and monstrously distorted. . . There are *no* 'pure' phenomena, nor can there be, either in Nature or in society,. . . the very concept of purity indicates a certain narrowness, a one-sidedness of human cognition, which cannot embrace an object in all its totality and complexity";[1]

(2) *the principle of studying phenomena in ceaseless motion and development (the principle of historicism,* which asserts the unity of the historical and the logical in the object being studied); in a lecture on the state, Lenin showed that a *scientific* examination of social phenomena is based on a consistent implementation of that principle, which enables the researcher "to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today";[2]

(3) *the principle of the concrete historical approach* in examining social phenomena (closely tied in with the principle of historicism, this principle presupposes an examination of any society, process or phenomenon with a view to the whole totality

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, pp. 235, 236.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "The State", *Collected Works,* Vol. 29, 1977, p. 473.

of its characteristics); in his *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,* Lenin exposed as scientifically invalid the a priori, dogmatic and abstract constructs of bourgeois sociology in dealing with the problems of the society and the individual in the context of metaphysical rhetoric about the "society", "progress" and the "historical process".[1]

Lenin showed that such an abstract, non-historical approach to the question about the essence of "society in general" is undialectical, "for, to begin by asking what is society and what is progress, is to begin at the end... This is a most obvious symptom of metaphysics".[2]

Another question that could arise here is whether all of the above means that historical materialism does not recognise any theoretical abstractions at all, just as the very possibility of general typologies of social phenomena. Not in the least. Historical materialism does not reject social typologies based on a study of the general development uniformities of complex social phenomena and processes. Historical materialism studies these on the strength of an analysis of the dialectics of the singular, the particular and the general. Thus, regarding social revolution as a phenomenon in its own right, the society as an integral whole, man as a social being, etc., historical materialism brings out and explains from a dialectical standpoint all the manifestations of the studied object through the singular, the particular and the general.

These categories of materialist dialectics are a major guide in social cognition.

Of great importance for historical materialism are also such key categories of materialist dialectics as relation, contradiction, rest and motion, quantity and quality, cause and effect, necessity and chance, form and content, possibility and reality, essence and appearance. Having been applied to social analysis, these have given rise to special categories of social dialectics: social contradiction, social content, social quality, etc.

The categories of materialist dialectics are a reliable theoretico-cognitive compass in studying the realities of social life and the laws of its development. Many of these crucial categories

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, 1972, p. 143.
[2] *Ibid.,* pp. 143-44.

have acquired a qualitatively new, sociological content in historical materialism, becoming an integral part of the system of concepts and categories of Marxist social theory.

5. BASIC CATEGORIES AND CONCEPTS

As we have already said, historical materialism uses in its conceptual system a number of special concepts (terms) and categories of dialectical materialism. That is only natural, for there are no impassable boundaries between dialectical and historical materialism. Filling out dialectico-materialist categories with its own content, historical materialism makes wide use of them for an analysis of social phenomena, incorporating them into its own system of categories.

Any system is characterised by: (1) unity, (2) integrity, (3) interconnection and orderly arrangement (a definite multi-level hierarchy) of its components (parts). The system of categories of historical materialism and its terminology are no exception in this respect. In their totality, the categories and key concepts of historical materialism reflect the objectively existing relations and connections between the social phenomena being studied. Their theoretical reflection by historical materialism adequately reproduces the actual system of interconnections between them. In analysing these phenomena, historical materialism seeks to give a correct explanation of the internal uniformities in the functioning and development of that system of interrelations. It studies the society as a system, as an integral entity, as a unity of its various aspects, without exaggerating the importance of some of these aspects at the expense of others.

Marxist social theory regards the unity of the society's constituent aspects and relations through a harmonious system of interconnected categories and concepts, applied to the most diverse spheres of social life. As a coherent social theory, historical materialism comprises a number of doctrines elaborated by its founders from every angle and explaining the uniformities of this or that sphere of social life. Among these doctrines one should primarily list the following: the doctrine of the mode of production; of socio-economic formations; of the state; of classes, class struggle and social revolution (including socialist revolution); of the socio-historical process, etc. Each of these doc-

trines has its own system of concepts, which is a part of the general, constantly developing system of categories and concepts of historical materialism.

In the most general form, that system can be presented as a totality of three interconnected terminological spheres.

The first includes "traditional" general philosophical terminology re-examined by the founders of Marxist social theory in accordance with the tasks of studying the society and history and giving their scientific explanation. It includes such traditional philosophical categories and concepts as activity, consciousness, being, subject, practice and others. When used in Marxist philosophy, each of these can differ markedly (both in the range of content and in meaning) from the seemingly identical terms relating either to earlier or to modern non-Marxist trends. One should never forget that in studying historical materialism and its terminology.

The second sphere contains the general sociological terminology specially elaborated by the founders of historical materialism and primarily connected with a study of material production and other spheres of social life as a whole (the productive forces and the relations of production, the mode of production, etc.). That terminology constitutes the core of the conceptual apparatus of historical materialism, and we shall examine it in detail.

The third sphere includes many concepts elaborated by pre-Marxist sociological thought (society, nation, state, class, ideology, etc.), but fully reconsidered by Marx, Engels and their followers in their scientific analysis of the key problems of the society, history and social cognition itself along new lines.

It is not surprising that the ideological adversaries of Marxism have been carrying on intensive and ceaseless polemics precisely round the latter terminology of historical materialism, which relates to ideology, politics, social psychology, spiritual culture, the problems of man, etc. They dispute the novelty of the content of its key concepts and categories and present them in a distorted light. Falsifications of historical materialism are often based precisely on such misinterpretations of the sociological content of some of its concepts and conceptions, which enhances the importance of their careful study on the strength of original Marxist-Leninist works.

The categories of "social being" and "social consciousness"

are the starting points of historical materialism, which studies the society in the light of the scientific answer to the basic question of philosophy and regards it as an integral system. These two categories enable one to get down to an analysis of various aspects of social life in their interconnection.

By *social being* historical materialism primarily means *the production of material values and the relations into which people enter in the process of that production*. Social being is people's economic, material life.

By *social consciousness* historical materialism means *the society's spiritual life as a unity of its constituent ideological elements* (political, legal, moral, aesthetical, and religious notions). Historical materialism devotes particular attention to the study of diverse forms of social consciousness, their functioning and interconnection, but without detaching these from its study of the processes of social being, which are specifically reflected in each of these forms of human consciousness (law, morality, religion, etc.).

In accordance with the scientific, dialectico-materialist world outlook, with the scientific answer to the basic question of philosophy, *historical materialism assumes the primacy of social being with regard to social consciousness,* recognising that *people's social being determines their social consciousness* (their ideas, goals and aspirations), rather than vice versa.

The initial, basic sociological categories of historical materialism, as it was noted above, include the mode of production, the productive forces and the relations of production; the basis and the superstructure; and the socio-economic formation.

Bringing out the essence of the materialist understanding of history in his foreword to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy,* Marx showed the interconnection between these key categories. He wrote: "In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process

of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or—this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms—with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure... No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society."[1]

The category of "socio-economic formation" is pivotal to the system of categories of historical materialism, making it possible to view the society as a single whole, from the positions of strict historicism. The substantiation by the founders of Marxist social theory of the category of socio-economic formation enabled them to replace the abstract discourse upon "society in general", which was typical of all pre-Marxist politico-economic, philosophical and social thought with a concrete analysis of different types of the society, whose development is governed by specific laws which are intrinsic to each of these. In that way, they laid the foundation of the scientific materialist view of social life as a unity of its diverse aspects, the socio-historical process as a whole.

In the course of polemics with bourgeois philosophy and sociology, historical materialism re-examined the content of many of their concepts in a fundamental way. But Marxist terminology patterned as "social" + "analysis" (crisis, conflict, etc.) should not be identified, as some modern critics of Marxism do, with the meaningless labels on everyday notions, with the game of "sociological" definitions, which is a favourite pastime of many bourgeois social scientists in our day. In their quest for "new" terms, they make diverse borrowings from the natural sciences

[1] Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, pp. 20-21.

and the everyday vocabulary. They "sociologise" these terms by adding the word "social", but are usually unable with the help of their newly coined terms adequately to bring out the essence of the phenomena in question. Such terms are sterile, scholastic and useless. Historical materialism, on the other hand, elaborates new concepts or borrows these from other areas in accordance with the actual requirements of the scientific analysis of the social phenomena.

In subsequent sections, we shall keep returning to the specific content of the key concepts and categories of historical materialism.

6. HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

As a philosophical theory of the most general laws and motive forces of mankind's social development, historical materialism provides general guidelines for social cognition, serving as its scientific methodology.

Methodology comes from the Greek words "study of method", where method (from the Greek word meaning way, mode of cognition) is a body of theoretical and practical rules and techniques helping man to master reality. Scientific *methodology* is a *system of definite theoretical principles, postulates and ensuing conclusions used by way of guidance in the study of reality,* in this or that particular field of reality, or in a definite scientific discipline.

The principles being consistently applied by historical materialism in studying and explaining social realities are highly important for any social discipline in our day, since the society makes increasing demands on the social sciences that study it. Its overall picture has become much more complicated in view of the unprecedented state of social development and various demographic, social, political and other changes. These changes put many complicated problems before researchers. How is one to explain these changes, bring out their essence, discern and forecast the tendencies of future development as accurately as possible?

For a successful solution of the problems of social cognition, confronted in one way or another by any of the social sciences, one should start from the initial propositions of historical mate-

rialism, from its basic principles, such as the principle of materialism, the principle of historicism, etc. Alongside materialist dialectics, or the universal philosophical method of cognition, historical materialism serves as a scientific methodology, providing reliable theoretico-cognitive guidelines for the most diverse social sciences. It promotes the successful development both of traditional and many new lines of research, studying diverse aspects of the society's material production and spiritual life and striving not only to understand its past and present, but also to foresee its future.

History, political economy, sociology, ethics, jurisprudence, psychology, literary criticism, linguistics—these and other social disciplines turn to historical materialism as to the theoretical, world-outlook foundation of scientific social cognition.

At the same time, Marxist social theory, or historical materialism, does not merely serve as a methodology of social cognition. Synthesising the results and conclusions of many social sciences and examining these from a philosophical and sociological angle, historical materialism is also a theoretical generalisation of socio-historical practice as a whole.

Since social cognition serves the definite practical interests of individuals, social groups and classes, the connection between social theory and definite social interests presupposes its *partisan nature*. When social disciplines are oriented towards the interests of social groups which seek to obstruct progress and perpetuate their positions to the detriment of the objective needs of the society as a whole, they are invariably drawn into defending these reactionary interests. Social theory, just as the social sciences in general, cannot therefore lay claim to objectively "neutral" knowledge, unrelated to any social values.

Social theory depends not only on human activity, but also on the conditions in which that activity takes place. At the same time, social theory is always connected with a definite philosophical line, with a struggle among parties and philosophies. Any stand, either "committed" or allegedly impartial, "value-neutral", is an expression of the partisan nature of social science. Historical materialism recognises the partisan principle as a basic principle of scientific cognition and, on the strength of its conclusions, of the transformation of social reality.

Scientific materialist theory correlates its conclusions with the

practical tasks of restructuring the society and promoting mankind's advance along the road of liberation from any forms of exploitation, poverty and injustice, towards a society where the free development of each individual becomes a condition for the free development of all.

In view of the place that belongs to historical materialism in the system of scientific philosophical knowledge and the specifics of its subject-matter as a social theory, historical materialism can be seen, first, as a definite *social philosophy,* a field of the philosophical analysis of social life; second, as a *philosophy of history,* which explains the main uniformities of the historical process; and third, as an *independent general sociological theory,* a theory of the society as an integral system in the unity of its constituent social institutions, processes and structures, their functioning and development.

Social philosophy, the philosophy of history, and sociology are mutually complementary aspects of historical materialism.

* * *

In summing up our review of the problems, principles, categories and concepts of historical materialism and its relations with other social sciences, let us note that:

—historical materialism formulates and resolves the key problems of social cognition connected with its range of subject-matter orientations;

—historical materialism has an independent and harmonious system of categories and concepts;

—there is a close interconnection between the categories and laws of materialist dialectics and the categories and concepts of historical materialism;

—historical materialism develops and deepens the categories of dialectics, applying these to an analysis of the problems of social cognition;

—historical materialism is deeply partisan, for it takes a resolute stand in defence of the goals and interests of the working class, the most progressive class of the society;

—historical materialism is a reliable theoretical foundation and methodology for the other social sciences.

Chapter Two

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST SOCIAL THEORY

"The whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system", Lenin wrote, "demands that each proposition should be considered (α) only historically, (β) only in connection with others, (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history."[1] So, in order to understand the specifics of historical materialism as an integral and independent scientific theory, let us examine the main stages of its development.

Its rise and development were not isolated from the mainstream of social thought, although they followed a specific, untrodden path.

1. THEORETICAL SOURCES

Historical materialism emerged and developed as an integral part of Marx's philosophical system of views and doctrine. "Marx", Lenin noted, "was the genius who continued and consummated the three main ideological currents of the nineteenth century, as represented by the three most advanced countries of mankind: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French socialism combined with French revolutionary doctrines in general."[2] What were these main ideological currents of the 19th century?

A connection with these crucial ideological and theoretical sources, on the one hand, and a striving to re-examine these sources in order to map out practical ways for a solution of the urgent tasks put forward by life itself (development of science,

[1] V. I. Lenin, "To Inessa Armand", *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, 1980, p. 250.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 50.

the requirements of the working people's revolutionary movement and its organisation), on the other, was what determined the development of the Marxist doctrine as an integral system of philosophical, economic and socio-political views.

Classical German philosophy. Marxist social theory stemmed from a critical re-examination by its founders of the views on man, the society and history that took shape in the classical German philosophy of the late 18th and the first half of the 19th century.

Marx and Engels started with the Young Hegelians, an independent trend which emerged from classical German philosophy. There was no unity among the Young Hegelians. It was only the most advanced section of the German intelligentsia (like Ludwig Feuerbach) which in its criticism of religion bordered on materialist views and openly clashed with Hegel's system.

The weakness of the German bourgeoisie and the socio-political conditions of the mid-19th-century Germany, which remained a fragmented, semi-feudal country, with numerous patriarchal structures, were given a peculiar ideological interpretation in classical German philosophy.

While being a summary of the historical experience of bourgeois revolutions, primarily the 18th-century revolution in Britain and the Great French Revolution of the late 18th century, a theoretical generalisation of that experience and its ideological expression, focusing the views of the advanced circles of the bourgeoisie in that period (a period of the breakdown of old feudal structures in the conditions of backward Germany), that philosophy was gradually losing its progressive orientation and increasingly giving way to compromise tendencies. Confining its studies to the spheres of abstract emotion and theorising spirit, and abstracting itself from a concrete social analysis of the motive forces of history and social development as a whole, German philosophy was in effect getting out of touch with the urgent problems of the day. On the whole, classical German philosophy was unable to draw close to an adequate reflection of man, the society and history.

At the same time, it made a considerable stride forward in the field of dialectics. A special contribution to dialectics was

made by Hegel, who saw it as the universal method of cognition, including historical cognition. At that time, Hegel's dialectics was "the most comprehensive and profound doctrine of development, and the richest in content".[1] It is not surprising, therefore, that Marx and Engels regarded that doctrine, which made it possible to trace the process of the quest for truth by philosophy itself, as the greatest achievement of classical German philosophy.

Upon Hegel's death, his dialectical system continued to spark disputes among his German disciples. The conservative wing of the Hegelians continued to cling to his system, interpreting it in a spirit of Protestant orthodoxy, while the radical, left-wing, Young Hegelians (Arnold Ruge, Bruno Bauer, and others) drew atheistic conclusions from Hegel's doctrine, denouncing the feudal monarchy in Germany and its trampling of civil liberties. The left Hegelians openly eulogised the traditions of the French bourgeois revolution and the republican form of government.

Ludwig Feuerbach heralded the materialist trend in the German philosophy of the late 1830s and early 1840s. His ideas had a particularly strong influence on the radical circles of the German intelligentsia. He criticised Hegel's philosophy of history and his idealistic system as a whole. But while criticising Hegel's idealism, Feuerbach also rejected his dialectics, instead of making a critical reassessment of it.

Feuerbach's materialist views were obviously marked by anthropologism. Resolutely denouncing vulgar and mechanistic materialism, he confined himself to abstract, non-historical and often purely biological interpretations of "human nature", failing to understand the social essence of man. The limitations of Feuerbach's anthropological materialism (just as those of all earlier materialism) were most evident in the question about the link between man and the society. In his view of history, Feuerbach remained an idealist, failing to arrive at a dialectico-materialist understanding of social life.

That was done by Marx and Engels, who re-examined the achievements of Hegel's dialectics in a critical spirit, combining its achievements with consistent materialism and spreading the latter to the understanding of history and the society.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 53.

English bourgeois political economy. Having taken shape in Britain, the most advanced industrial country of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, bourgeois political economy sought to bring out the internal structure of capitalist production. The leading representatives of classical English political economy—Adam Smith and David Ricardo—analysed the economic system of British capitalism and founded the labour theory of value. That was their great historical achievement. But as they laid bare and analysed the laws of capitalist social production, bourgeois political economists did not realise the historically changing, transient nature of these laws. They portrayed these laws as "eternal" and "natural", avoiding an examination of the social antagonisms connected with these economic laws.

As the positions of the bourgeoisie strengthened, as the working class appeared on the historical scene as an independent political and social force defending its own rights, and as the class struggle in the society intensified, the scientific disinterestedness of bourgeois political economy even at that time began to give way to an apologetics of the economic and social realities of capitalism. On the principles of rationalist philosophy, classical bourgeois political economy sought to derive the economic laws of capitalism from the nature of the "economic man" *(homo economicus)* himself, an individual entering into economic relations with other individuals.

Bourgeois economists "overlooked" (as Marx first showed in his works) the *social nature of production* and of the production relations which take shape in the production process. In place of what bourgeois economists saw solely as relations between things (an exchange of one commodity for another), Marx discovered the actual relations between people as relations between commodity producers. In examining these social relations, he eventually established that the commodity itself is an embodiment of definite production relations, and that commodity fetishism characterises the capitalist mode of production as a whole. Marx defined commodity fetishism as attributing to a commodity definite properties (connected with the self-expansion of its value) which reflect these relations.[1]

---

[1] See Karl Marx, *Capital,* Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 77; *idem., Capital,* Vol. III, 1974, p. 881.

Marx pinpointed the true sources of the capitalist's profit, and explained the mechanisms of capital accumulation as the result of a definite economic and social system of production, under which human labour-power becomes a commodity as the wage-worker sells it to the owner of the means of production and creates surplus-value, the source of the wealth of the capitalist class.

French utopian socialism. The founders of historical materialism also drew on the conceptions of utopian socialism, a widespread ideological trend of the 19th century.

These conceptions were highly critical of capitalism, for their advocates dreamed of a better social set-up, a society free from exploitation, inequality, and humiliation of the individual. Spreading wide in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions in Europe, the theories of utopian socialism expressed the disenchantment with the results of these revolutions. The authors of these theories were convinced that a fairer social system should be based on the achievements of capitalism and, at the same time, on a recognition of legal, political and social equality with regard to property. Henri Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier and Robert Owen, the leading theorists of utopian socialism, placed their main emphasis on the question of restructuring the society on the principles of the Enlightenment and a peaceful propaganda of socialist ideas, without any revolution. But alongside these undoubtedly fantastic projects, the theories of the utopian socialists also contained a number of valuable propositions (on historical progress, labour education, planned economic development, on overcoming the antithesis between mental and manual work, between town and country, etc.). Many of these tenets were assimilated and eventually reworked by the founders of Marxist social theory.

With the emergence of Marxism, utopian socialism did not disappear of its own accord, and its development continued in contrast to the scientific socialism of Marx and his followers. In our day, utopian socialism is one of the lines of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thought. As their reflection, it continues to exert a certain influence on the ideologues of national liberation, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements, especially in countries where capitalist development has been slow and uneven, where

vestiges of the past still remain, and where the need to overcome these vestiges is translated into diverse utopian ideals of revolutionary democracy (the peasant socialism of the Narodniks in 19th-century Russia), left and right populism (Latin America in the 1950s-1980s) and "third way" conceptions (Asian and African countries in the 1950s-1980s).

Although the utopian conceptions of socialism in our day emphasise the question of how to restructure the society, they cannot give a correct answer to it, for they lack an understanding of the essence of economic and social inequality under capitalism, the laws of its development, and the motive forces that are capable of creating a new society.

2. HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS

So, the main theoretical sources of Marxism were, first, classical German philosophy; second, English political economy; and third, French utopian socialism.

The emergence of Marxist social theory, the way for which was paved by the whole preceding development of progressive philosophical, political and social thought, was also connected with definite historical conditions, which should be considered in this context.

The 19th century was an epoch of the bourgeois society's worsening economic contradictions and mounting social conflicts. In Europe (primarily in Britain, Belgium and France), and also in the USA, the first half of the 19th century was a period when capitalism asserted itself. In other countries, it was still at relatively early stages of its development.

In spite of the uneven development of capitalism, a world capitalist market was already being formed at that time, promoted by the growth of international trade, the internationalisation of production ties and the most diverse forms of division of labour and exchange. All of that created conditions for an approximation of the processes of spiritual life (including cultural and scientific) in different countries of the world.

Industrial development in the European and other countries led to considerable changes in the social make-up of the population, primarily through an accelerated numerical growth of the industrial proletariat, a new social class. The growth of capitalist production, however, did not entail an improvement of the work-

ing people's living standards. Even at that time, the proletariat was already beginning to realise the need for an organised struggle for its vital rights, something that helped to consolidate the working-class movement.

The development of a massive working-class movement made it ever more necessary to elucidate the tasks of the working people's economic (and, later on, political) struggle for their vital rights. The working-class movement had to have its own, independent ideological and theoretical platform. The development of such a theory, which would equip the proletarian movement with a correct understanding of its tasks and would meet its ideological and practical demands, called for new principles and a new approach to an assessment of the problems facing the movement, with a view to the concrete social, historical, and political conditions of the epoch.

With the growth of revolutionary sentiments in Europe and the invigoration of the proletariat's struggle for its rights, the working-class movement of the late 1840s faced a most imperative problem: that of its theoretical and practical leadership. The movement was gathering momentum in Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Britain and Italy, turning into an international phenomenon on the eve of the bourgeois revolutions of the 1840s.

All of that could not pass unnoticed for bourgeois philosophers and social scientists, as they witnessed the erosion of the idea about the abiding nature of the society based on private property, exploitation, and deep-rooted social inequality.

However, the problems of development of the bourgeois society raised by social theorists serving the interests of the propertied classes remained beyond their comprehension: on the whole, social science in that period was still far from an adequate formulation and understanding of the contradictions of social development, primarily in view of the inconsistent and limited world-outlook principles underlying bourgeois philosophical and sociological thought, and in view of the fact that it advocated a bourgeois class stand. The thing to do, therefore, was fully to re-examine the world-outlook principles lying at the root of social cognition.

It was Marx and Engels who undertook that difficult task, making a critical study not only of the successes scored by the

various social, economic and philosophical doctrines of the day, but also of their mistakes and shortcomings. Marx and Engels, the two most progressive thinkers of the day, succeeded in doing that. They assimilated the achievements of European philosophy and science, re-examined them and fitted them into their new, dialectico-materialist world outlook.

3. THE FOUNDERS OF THE MATERIALIST THEORY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Marx's theoretical and practical activity in the 1840s led him up to a clash, and then to a complete break with the Young Hegelians. Realising that their doctrines were totally invalid, he rejected their conservative, conciliatory tendency.

In the mid-1840s, Marx was already very close to materialism. At that time, he made an intensive study of history, political economy and the ideas of utopian socialism. Under the impact of the revolutionary upswing in Germany and other countries, Marx (together with Engels, whom he met in Paris in 1844 and with whom he worked for many years) came to the conclusion of the need to combine the working people's movement for their vital rights with a new scientific world outlook.

Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* were the first theoretical step in that direction. Later on, he wrote his *Theses on Feuerbach* (1845) and *The Poverty of Philosophy* (1847). Together with Engels, he wrote *The Holy Family* (1845) and *The German Ideology* (1845-1846), which were major landmarks along the way of fruitful cooperation between the two outstanding thinkers in elaborating dialectical and historical materialism.

In 1848, Marx and Engels wrote the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* on the instructions of the Second Congress of the Communist League, the first international organisation of the proletariat. As Lenin put it, the *Manifesto* contained "a new world-conception, consistent materialism, which also embraces the realm of social life".[1]

The *Manifesto* was a reflection of the scientific, materialist view of history and contained the basic propositions of the theory of class struggle, seen as the main motive force of history. The

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 48.

Manifesto brought out and substantiated the role of the proletariat as the progressive social class in the struggle for revolutionary economic, political and social transformations.

Many provisions of the *Manifesto* were eventually developed in subsequent works by the founders of scientific communism. As Marx and Engels created the new philosophy and the scientific materialist theory of the society closely connected with it, they simultaneously pointed out the way to a solution of a whole range of urgent problems of scientific theory and revolutionary practice. The new philosophy—dialectical and historical materialism—was meant to answer imperative questions of the day, substantiate the new understanding of the laws of nature and the society, and provide a theoretical foundation for the scientific world outlook.

In elaborating the problems of philosophical materialism, Marx and Engels gave the deepest-ever analysis of capitalism, one of the most complicated socio-economic formations. Marx's greatest politico-economic work was *Capital,* on which he worked for something like 40 years, until his death. Alongside an in-depth economic analysis of the true essence of the capitalist mode of production as the basis of the system of relations constituting the bourgeois society, and alongside a critique of the theories of bourgeois political economy as its reflection, Marx elaborated from every angle the materialist understanding of history and the problems relating to the scientific method of historical research. In showing the essence of that method, Lenin emphasised: "In *Capital,* Marx applied to a single science logic, dialectics and the theory of knowledge of materialism. . ."[1]

Capital's method is an organic unity of the materialist understanding of history, the laws of dialectics, its key categories and modes of research. At the same time, *Capital*'s approach to an analysis of the bourgeois realities implies an interaction of all the components of the Marxist doctrine: philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism.

In his *Capital*, Marx deepened the understanding of the general structure of the society, the main uniformities of its development as a succession of socio-economic formations. While examining the dialectics of the labour process, of social produc-

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Plan of Hegel's Dialectics (Logic)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, 1980, p. 317.

tion, Marx also laid bare the main prerequisites for changes in the social structure, for its revolutionary transformation. It is only in the context of *Capital* that one can understand both the earlier works of the founders of Marxism, projecting the main lines of historical and social research, and their subsequent works, containing a theoretical generalisation of the experience of bourgeois revolutions, like *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (1850), *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), and also such summary works as *The Civil War in France* (1871) and *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (1875).

Engels, whose scientific and publicistic activity was closely tied in with Marx's theoretical interests and creative quest, also did a great deal to elaborate the principles of the historical materialist analysis of the society and its development laws. In *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1844-1845), *Principles of Communism* (1847), *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany* (1852), in his 1867 reviews of the first volume of *Capital,* showing its significance, and also in his *Anti-Dühring* (1876-1878), *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884) and *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* (1886), Engels elucidated and specified many questions of the scientific materialist view of history, the key propositions and principles of Marxist social theory and social reconstruction.

A major step on the way to the new social theory was the rejection by its founders of the predominant abstract and speculative view of philosophy, a view which diverted philosophy from man's practical tasks.

Rejecting idealism in the understanding of history and the society, Marx and Engels envisaged the new philosophy as a world outlook and, at the same time, as a theory of the practical transformation of obsolete social relations. So, for the first time in the history of philosophy and social thought, Marx and Engels connected the problem of restructuring the society not only with the changes effected by philosophy in human minds, but also with a radical re-orientation of social practice itself. That was the fundamental distinction of the new materialism extended by Marx and Engels to the sphere of social cognition from the views on history and the society contained in earlier and contemporary philosophical and sociological conceptions. As

Marx wrote at the time, "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses."[1]

Marx and Engels consistently deepened and developed the basic propositions of their social theory, criticising the contemplative and limited world outlooks of earlier philosophy, making a politico-economic study of the genesis of capitalism and its development, polemicising with the apologetic conceptions of the English economists (primarily Adam Smith and David Ricardo, who asserted the "eternal" nature of private property) and with various sociological conceptions (the Young Hegelians, Thomas Carlyle, and others), and analysing the experience of the European working-class movement in the context of the 19th-century bourgeois revolutions. Their theory was the outcome of a long period which lasted for almost half a century (from 1843, when Marx wrote his *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law*, in which he first began to elaborate the principles of his new theory, and up to the early 1890s, when Engels wrote his well-known letters on historical materialism, summing up the results of his and Marx's elaboration of the fundamental problems of social cognition). All these years, they kept re-examining in a critical spirit the experience they had gained through a study of various aspects of life under capitalism and an analysis of the achievements and conclusions that were at the disposal of the social sciences at that time.

Historical materialism developed in constant polemics with institutionalised, academic bourgeois social science, in opposition to its conceptions. Hence the attitude of bourgeois social scientists to historical materialism: they ignored it in the lifetime of its founders (alongside criticism and "refutations"), and later on resorted to an ever more refined falsification of its major propositions.

Nevertheless, in the specific conditions of capitalist development in the final decades of the 19th century, Marxism aroused exceptional interest, especially among the revolutionary-minded

[1] Karl Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 182.

representatives of the working class in countries such as Britain, France, Germany and Russia (and many other countries of Europe and America), which were entering the phase of accelerated industrial development. Capitalist industrialisation in these countries swelled the ranks of the proletariat, promoted its rapid concentration, and aggravated many social contradictions. It is only natural, therefore, that in their quest for an answer to the burning questions of social development progressive social strata in these countries increasingly turned to Marxist thought. The experience accumulated by revolutionary and national liberation movements in that period also promoted a rapid spread of Marxism on the European and American continents.

The spread of Marxism, however, was accompanied by an activisation of forces which opposed the very idea of radical social transformations, taking an apologetic stand with regard to the capitalist system. At that time, the question about the ways of its transformation—reform or revolution—was particularly acute, causing numerous disputes and discussions and so also various utopian and often most contradictory projects of social "renewal".

Thus, the European socialist working-class movement was marked by ever more evident retrograde tendencies, connected with the attempts of some of its leaders (Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky and others) to revise and re-interpret the major propositions of the Marxist doctrine of revolution. Trends connected with right-wing opportunism and revisionism were gaining ground, and there was also a wide spread of "leftist" theories (in the form of "revolutionary syndicalism"—mostly in the Romanic countries where anarchist traditions were particularly tenacious).

In the conditions of the steady rise of the revolutionary working-class movement, the task of defending the achievements of Marxist thought became ever more imperative. Marxist propagandists were doing a great deal to that effect. Josef Dietzgen and Franz Mehring (Germany), Paul Lafargue (France), Dmitri Blagoev (Bulgaria), Antonio Labriola (Italy), José Mesa (Spain), Georgi Plekhanov (Russia), Carlos Mariátegui (Peru), and others raised a resolute voice against any distortions of the key theoretical propositions and conclusions of the Marxist doctrine.

The advocates of Marxism also did a great deal to develop

the principles of the scientific critique of idealism and subjectivism in philosophy and sociology. A critical analysis of the experience of the working-class movement and social development in general, on the one hand, and of the tendencies of its reflection by bourgeois thought and the petty-bourgeois mentality, on the other—such was the main line along which Marxist propagandists sought to strengthen the positions of the scientific world outlook.

Under the deepening socio-political crisis of tsarism in Russia and a steady upswing of the revolutionary movement, the advanced section of the Russian society in the final quarter of the 19th century showed a growing interest in Marxism and, in their search for answers to the urgent questions of the day, increasingly turned to Marxism. It was necessary to combat the various revisionist trends in philosophy and sociology, which were spreading and becoming ever more active both in Europe and Russia itself, and which openly sought to falsify the Marxist doctrine. In Russia's liberal philosophical, economic and sociological thought in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, there was hardly a single trend which did not seek a "dialogue" with Marxism, claiming either to "refute" or to "supplement" and "critically develop" it in a bid to adapt Marxism to the needs of an ideological renewal of the various devalued and bankrupt apologetic bourgeois doctrines.

There was an abundance of such trends: economism, Narodism, "legal Marxism" (and in bourgeois philosophy—Machism, the Russian version of empirio-criticism), to say nothing of openly anti-Marxist trends, and all of these clamoured for a "review" of the theoretical legacy of Marx and Engels.

In these extremely complicated conditions, the most pressing task was to maintain and defend the progressive Marxist revolutionary doctrine. In order to do that, one had to answer the imperative questions of the revolutionary movement, its theory and practice. Under the confrontation between the progressive, proletarian ideology and the reactionary, bourgeois ideology of the period, all this required, first and foremost a convincing theoretical and socio-critical analysis of the unsound petty-bourgeois and other similar philosophical and sociological theories.

In late 19th-century and early 20th-century Russia, that task was undertaken by Lenin, whose works contained the fullest and

consistent answer to the objective of maintaining and developing the Marxist theory in a creative spirit.

Lenin made an immense contribution to the struggle against bourgeois revisionist and dogmatic distortions of the Marxist theory, ushering in a new period of its fruitful development. Leninism was a direct continuation of the Marxist doctrine and a new phase in its history, a major achievement not only of Russian, but also of world science and culture. Lenin's contribution to the development of Marxism was not confined, as Western theorists sometimes allege, to the historical destiny of Russia alone. Having tied in the tasks of its revolutionary transformation with the main conclusions stemming from the Marxist doctrine, Lenin creatively developed that doctrine in accordance with the new realities of world development and the present epoch as a whole. That is why Lenin's contribution to Marxist theory is still relevant in our day.

In his first major work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,* written in 1894, Lenin already analysed and invalidated the sociological views of the Russian Narodniks (as well as sociological subjectivism as a whole), their interpretations of social life, and showed their unscientific basis.

In a period when both Russian and Western sociology were witnessing a revival of Comtism and positivism, on the one hand, and a growing interest in neo-Kantianism with a resultant emergence and strengthening of subjectivist orientations, on the other, Lenin's theoretical conclusions reaffirmed that the truly scientific tradition of sociological thinking goes back to the Marxist philosophy, and that this tradition is closely tied in with the scientific dialectical methodology of social cognition. It was Marx, as Lenin emphasised, who had discovered and explained from a consistently scientific standpoint the objective laws of the society and its progressive development, for the first time ever putting sociology on a strictly scientific basis.[1]

In that work, Lenin showed the essence and the indissoluble unity of the philosophical and general sociological foundations of Marxist social theory. In accordance with Marx, he proved that the dialectical method, "which consists in regarding society as a living organism in a state of constant development", had

[1] See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, pp. 165-66.

been and remained the only scientific method of social cognition.[1] In his polemics with the subjectivist sociological conceptions of the Russian Narodniks (and other similar theories), Lenin emphasised that under the Marxist approach the society is viewed as an aggregate of social relations constituting an integral social organism, which changes according to objective laws intrinsic to it alone.[2]

Lenin's *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* was of great importance for a critique of the whole system of subjective-idealist views characteristic of Russian (and foreign) idealist philosophy and sociology. That work marked the beginning of a new stage in the development of Marxism, in the elaboration of the key problems of Marxist social theory. It reflected one of the main specific features of Lenin's thinking as a Marxist philosopher and sociologist: his ability to apply general principles and theoretical propositions to an analysis of concrete historical and social reality, to the political tasks stemming from the conditions of the class struggle carried on by the proletariat and its allies.

In that work, Lenin countered subjectivism and the metaphysical method of thinking with Marxist dialectics, applying the scientific dialectical assumption that truth is concrete to the cognition of social life. He elaborated the materialist understanding of the laws of social development, and the role of the masses, classes, and individuals in history. Examining the essence of the revolution in philosophy and social cognition carried out by Marx and Engels, Lenin passionately defended the Marxist, materialist understanding of history and continued elaborating such key categories of historical materialism as socio-economic formation, mode of production, social relations, etc.

The principles for a critique of anti-Marxist philosophical and sociological conceptions outlined in that work were subsequently deepened and developed in Lenin's later works. He gave a meaningful critical analysis of the "objectivism" of bourgeois social science in "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", an article written and published in 1894-1895, and also in his *Uncritical Criticism*, which came out in 1900. In these works, Lenin showed the futil-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

ity of the efforts by the so-called "legal Marxists" to impose a "supra-class" stand and abstract "humanism" on social science.

In contrast to the bourgeois objectivism of the "legal Marxists", Lenin advocated a consistent Marxist understanding of the partisan nature of the social sciences. He showed the faults of Narodism and "legal Marxism", conditioned by their petty-bourgeois class nature: idealism, inconsistency, "abstract dogmatism" and, in consequence of that, an inability to make a concrete analysis of real phenomena. Coming out against any dogmatism, Lenin emphasised: "We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."[1]

The works written by Lenin on the eve of the First Russian Revolution of 1905 and right after it made a considerable contribution to Marxist social theory.

In these works *(Where to Begin, What Is to Be Done?, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back,* and *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution),* he focussed on a dialectico-materialist analysis of the working-class struggle and its tactics under a bourgeois-democratic revolution and the perspectives of its development into a socialist revolution. In elaborating the problems of the working people's revolutionary struggle, Lenin developed and specified the key propositions of the Marxist doctrine on the growing importance of the subjective factor in the historical process, on the role of the masses, the proletariat and its party in a democratic revolution, and on the diversity of the concrete forms and methods of the working people's class struggle for radical social transformations.

Against the background of the intensive struggle between classes and ideologies, which in that period permeated virtually every area of life in Russia, Lenin continued his struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois conceptions, which were hostile to historical materialism, which rejected the proletariat's leading role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution as the vanguard of the working masses, and which saw the bourgeoisie as the "hegemonic force" of the social movement. He proved beyond any doubt

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Our Programme", *Collected Works,* Vol. 4, 1977, pp. 211-12.

that these theorists took a bourgeois class stand, that they deliberately "disparage the materialist conception of history by ignoring the active, leading and guiding part which can and must be played in history by parties that have realised the material prerequisites of a revolution and have placed themselves at the head of the progressive classes."[1]

Lenin showed that under the new balance of forces in Russia, the revolution-fearing bourgeoisie wanted a compromise, a deal with tsarism in order to retain its privileges and its position, that the true hegemonic force of the revolution was the working class, which was able in alliance with the peasantry and other semi-proletarian strata to carry out radical social transformations, and that such an alliance of the toiling classes was an expression of the objective law of action by the masses, the leading force of history.

In his "Preface to the Russian Translation of Karl Marx's *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann*" (1907), Lenin emphasised the need to regard history "from the standpoint of those who *make* it" and to attach paramount importance to "the *historical initiative* of the masses", tying in the theory and practice of revolutionary transformations, as required by the conditions of the working people's struggle for their vital rights, without any attempts to adjust or distort these in order to justify the existing system.[2]

After the defeat of the revolution of 1905, Russia went through a period of reaction. The prevailing mood in the country was one of pessimism, with a marked invigoration of diverse idealistic philosophico-religious trends, including those of god-seeking and god-building. Via journalism, fiction and art, the ideas connected with these trends spread among and were assimilated by diverse social groups and strata. Their influence was also evident among Russia's working class.

In analysing the ideological situation at the time, Lenin formulated a set of basic theoretical propositions of historical materialism, showing the specifics of political and spiritual culture, and the peculiarities of its functioning under definite class relations and socio-class structures. In such articles as "Party Organisation and Party Literature" (1905), "Leo Tolstoy as the Mir-

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1977, p. 44.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, 1977, pp. 109, 111.

ror of the Russian Revolution" (1908), "Marxism and Revisionism" (1908), he showed the concrete sociological content of the processes in spiritual life connected with literary, scientific, politico-journalistic and other types of creative spiritual activity. He showed that the artist, scientist or journalist is closely tied in with the society in which and for which he works, that he is responsible to it for the results of his work, for his special, conscious civic stand, which implies defence of the definite interests of definite classes and the partisan nature of literature, art, philosophy and other social sciences. In his "Marxism and Revisionism", Lenin pointed out the philosophical sources of revisionism in the working-class movement and exposed the attempts to "combine" Marxism with hostile idealistic doctrines and to renounce materialist dialectics.

Lenin's articles aimed against the influence of religious ideas on the working-class movement, primarily *The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion* and *Classes and Parties in Their Attitude to Religion and the Church* (spring and summer 1909), were of exceptional importance in that period. In these articles, Lenin outlined and substantiated the Party's tactics in matters of religion on the strength of the basic propositions of Marxist atheism, supplementing and developing these in a brilliant way.

In that period of political reaction, idealist philosophy served as an active ideological vehicle for the attempts to revise the basic theoretical principles of the Marxist doctrine. In their struggle against that doctrine, the ideologues of the Russian bourgeoisie turned to the "latest" (including Western) forms of idealism, spreading disbelief in the existence of objective laws of social progress and the possibility of their scientific cognition. In these complicated conditions, it was more important than ever before to expose the idealist and subjectivist tricks of bourgeois philosophy and social science.

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* which he wrote in the period from February to October 1908, and which became his main philosophical work, Lenin gave a well-argumented critical analysis of the "latest" forms of idealism. In that book, he answered the difficult questions raised by the development of philosophy, the natural sciences and social cognition. In the brilliant polemical form of an intense and ceaseless dialogue with the opponents of Marxism, Lenin invalidated the idealistic spec-

ulations on the latest theoretico-cognitive and social problems, and gave a detailed solution of these problems from the standpoint of dialectical and historical materialism.

He then went on to criticise the idealistic schools of bourgeois philosophy and sociology of the imperialist epoch. He examined the idealistic roots of the subjectivism of the so-called "empirio-critical" philosophy and showed it to be antithetical to the scientific materialist understanding of the problems of natural science and social cognition. Empirio-criticism (as represented by the Russian Machists) sought to "supplement" and "develop" Marxist philosophy on the principles of agnosticism. Tracing the connection of empirio-criticism to the so-called "immanent school" and other idealistic tendencies in philosophy, Lenin showed the reactionary nature of its conceptions, which lead up to fideism (reliance on faith rather than reason).

Lenin criticised V. Bazarov, A. Bogdanov (Malinovsky) and other Russian Machists, and showed the complete untenability of their "theories", in which social being was in effect identified with social consciousness. He showed that the objective logic of social development and its laws could not be reduced to a subjective reflection of social reality by the human consciousness. Consistently advocating the materialist approach to social research, Lenin brought out and substantiated the basic uniformities of the dialectics of social being and its reflection in human consciousness, the former's independence from the latter and, at the same time, the active, creative role of social consciousness (primarily the consciousness of progressive social classes) in the fundamental transformations of the capitalist society.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* Lenin upheld the Marxist understanding of cognition, just as philosophy itself, as a socially conditioned process. He proved the unavoidably partisan nature of any philosophy, including that which claims (as the Machists did) to "overcome the extremes" of materialism and idealism, and to have its special "supra-party" world outlook. In actual fact, as Lenin showed, the "supra-party" position of the Machists primarily meant a refusal to put philosophy at the service of scientific cognition and its progress. He countered the Machists' claims with the consistent and strictly partisan position of Marxist philosophy, which geared the process of man's cognition of the world to the task of its radical transformation.

While elaborating the cardinal problems of scientific materialist philosophy, Lenin sought to propagate the Marxist heritage as a whole. In March 1913, he published "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", which contained a scientific periodisation of the main stages in the development of Marxism. Another of his works published that year—"The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism"—analysed the historical roots of the Marxist doctrine, its continuity with the early achievements of progressive thought. In November 1914, Lenin's short article "Karl Marx" was published. Written specially for the *Granat Encyclopaedia,* it was meant for the mass reader and gave a full and profound characterisation of Marx's doctrine in a simple and concise form.

Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916) was a creative elaboration of the main conclusions of Marx's analysis of capitalism. In that book, he showed the dialectics of the contradictions in the social and economic development of the contemporary capitalist society, which created the prerequisites for a socialist revolution, for a replacement of capitalism with socialism. On the strength of his earlier-discovered law of imperialism's uneven economic and political development, Lenin consistently substantiated and developed his earlier conclusion (first formulated in his work "On the Slogan for a United States of Europe" in 1915) about the possibility of a socialist revolution winning out first in one or several countries.

Later on, Lenin continued to focus his attention on the question about the ways and forms of socialist revolution. The key problems of Marxist social theory connected with that question—analysis of the class essence of different types of democracy and dictatorship, forms of power, and conditions under which the state is maintained or disappears—were examined in *The State and Revolution* (1917), *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* (1918), *The State* (1919), *"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder* (1920), and others.

Lenin specified, deepened and developed the main problems of Marxist social theory in the context of the concrete tasks of the working-class struggle. He not only tied in Marxist ideas and conclusions with the needs of revolutionary practice, but creatively developed and applied these ideas in the course of the socialist revolution in Russia and in the subsequent struggle

to restructure the backward country and turn it into an advanced, economically and politically independent state, the first state in history to build a socialist society, which took a short time to eliminate exploitation, mass unemployment, illiteracy, economic and social inequality.

Lenin's contribution to the social theory founded by Marx and Engels is not confined to some of its aspects or conclusions. Lenin's theory of revolution, his doctrine of the state, and his ideas on socialist construction consistently developed, deepened and supplemented the crucial philosophical and sociological conclusions of Marx and Engels. The practice of building the new society in the USSR and other countries, now advancing along the road of socialism, peace and progress, reaffirms the historical value of Lenin's contribution to the scientific revolutionary theory of the world's renewal.

Lenin's contribution to Marxist theory is inseparable from the doctrine bequeathed to us by Marx, Engels and their followers. He is the one who extended the conclusions of Marxism to social practice in the 20th century. As a continuation of Marxism, Leninism makes up with it a single, indivisible whole: Marxism-Leninism. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine is the Marxism of the 20th century.

* * *

In summing up Chapter Two, let us go over its main points:

—Marxist social theory emerged as a continuation and development of the main achievements accumulated by the earlier philosophical and social thought of the most advanced countries;

—developing in the course of intensive class battles in the capitalist society, that theory was a logical result of the scientific analysis of its main tendencies, the outcome of the new, materialist understanding of history;

—that theory was founded by Marx and Engels, and Lenin elaborated its main propositions in a consistent and creative way;

—Lenin upheld historical materialism against attacks by its adversaries, deepening, developing and creatively applying its key propositions to the practical revolutionary transformation of the capitalist society;

—the importance of Lenin's contribution to Marxist social theory is confirmed by the whole course of present-day social development.

Chapter Three

THE SOCIETY AND HISTORY

1. NATURE AND THE SOCIETY

Marx and Engels showed in *The German Ideology* that the very existence of living human individuals is the first real prerequisite of human history. That is why the first concrete fact from which one should proceed in studying the history of the human society is "the physical organisation of these individuals and their consequent relation to the rest of nature".[1] Man, just as the society in which he lives, is a part of nature, is inseparable from it and keeps interacting with it.

What is the interconnection between the human society and the natural world? What is its basis?

Marxist theory answers each of these questions on the assumption that man cannot exist without satisfying his intrinsic, natural, biological needs, primarily the need for food, clothes, a roof over one's head, protection from adverse natural influences (natural disasters, etc.)

The source from which all these needs are met is *human labour*. As he begins to work in order to produce the values necessary to maintain his existence, man enters into direct contact with nature. Joining their efforts in the labour process, people produce the necessary food and clothes, build houses, etc.

From the earliest days of human history, labour, material production has been the initial prerequisite for an interaction between people and the surrounding natural world, a source of the interconnection between nature and society. The genesis of the human society is closely tied in with human labour, with the development of material production.

It was only with the development of labour activity that man gradually stood out from nature. The historical importance of labour was brilliantly analysed by Engels in "The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man" (1876). He

[1] Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 1976, p. 31.

showed the emergence of man and primitive human association with the development of human labour itself, of labour activity as production by people of the means and conditions for their existence. In the process of labour (which was the initial form of man's interaction with the surrounding natural world), man learned to *produce,* i.e., to create the material values he needs, developing material and spiritual culture and changing his own self.

How did that process occur?

At first, man took the necessary material values from nature in ready-made form, but eventually he also learned to make such values from the simple natural components available to him (wood, stone, etc.). In order to meet his vital needs, man was obliged to keep perfecting his tools and the techniques of producing these. Their perfection was parallelled by a development of man's labour skills. So, the character of labour and its organisation kept changing.

As labour was complexified, man had ever greater possibilities for influencing nature. The development of labour cooperation had immense consequences for the formation of man as a social being. Social relations between people took shape in close connection with the development of their joint labour activity, with the development of the *social character of labour.*

Marx and Engels resolutely came out against any idealistic conceptions of labour and of human activity as a whole. Such conceptions are still being expounded by anthropologically oriented and subjectivist trends of non-Marxist philosophy, which contrast man and the society with the natural world, and so accentuate the "antithesis" between the production and the spiritual aspects of social life.

Marx and Engels showed that any attempt to contrast nature and the society is based on essentially incorrect, idealistic premises, and that it is only possible to take a scientific view of the correlation between the social and natural prerequisites of human life from the standpoint of the dialectico-materialist world outlook. On the strength of such a dialectico-materialist understanding of the correlation between these two aspects of human life and activity—an understanding of the dialectical interdependence of the natural and the social—Marxism shows the formation and development of human practice in the course of interaction

between man and nature as the first and necessary prerequisite of that activity.

Geographical environment. The geographical environment constitutes the immediate natural conditions of human labour activity.

The geographical environment is the part of nature (soil, rivers, seas, climate, etc.) *that is connected with all the aspects of human life and activity in the society.*

Marxist social theory views the society as a *discrete part of nature,* coming out against the two extreme views: against an exaggeration of the role of nature in social development and against any underestimation of its influence on social progress.

The scientific explanation of the interconnection between the natural and the social conditions of human life is based on this dialectical formula: "In changing nature, man changes his own self." One of the cornerstones of Marxist social theory is Marx's proposition that nature influences human history solely through material production, depending on the level of its development.[1] That proposition makes it possible to see how purposeful human activity changes the natural conditions of human life, influences man's access to natural resources and through these exerts an impact on the society.

At the same time, the interaction between man and nature cannot be reduced to a one-way "appropriation" of natural resources by human beings. As man's habitat, nature itself is a crucial condition of his activity.

It is common knowledge that the geographical and ecological environments have a marked influence on the development of man's production of material values. That influence, however, should not be oversimplified, for it manifests itself in the context of definite social conditions of production. The availability or absence of mineral resources, a favourable or unfavourable climate, and other geographical factors can have a certain influence on the development of production. In themselves, however, these factors do not predetermine the nature of the production process and social development. They can only promote or slow down the development of social production, thereby also influencing the process of social development.

One should only look at the problems of economic back-

[1] See Karl Marx, *Capital,* Vol. I, pp. 480-82.

wardness facing some developing countries to understand that concrete interdependence. In spite of their abundant mineral resources, their favourable climate and rich farmland, these countries cannot as yet make full use of their resources. They are prevented from doing so by the political and economic sway of big transnational corporations (TNCs), imposed and sustained by imperialism. The TNCs use every means at their disposal to make profit through the plunderous exploitation of the developing countries' natural and manpower resources. That is one of the aspects of the interaction between nature and the society under capitalism. Under socialism, the interaction between them is quite different. Rational use of natural and manpower resources under socialism is a powerful instrument for accelerating social progress.

So, it is precisely under the influence of social factors that human attitudes to nature as to the source of material values and a natural habitat keep changing and material production keeps developing. An exaggeration of the influence of climate (and the geographical environment as a whole) on social development, which marks a number of sociological approaches, usually leads to a one-sided understanding of the interaction between nature and the society. These approaches are part of the so-called geographical trend, which comprises both "traditional" theories of non-Marxist sociology based on a naturalistic exaggeration of the role played by the geographical environment in social development (the geographical determinism theories of Henry Thomas Buckle, Victor Cousin and others, "social geography", and geopolitical doctrines justifying the political, economic and military expansion of the imperialist states on the pretext of the need for "living space"), and relatively new (ecological) conceptions, which are looking for ways to "alleviate" the contradictions of capitalism through a more rational use of natural resources.

On the strength of its understanding of the dialectical interconnection between nature and the society, Marxist social theory regards the society as a sphere of the integral natural world, and the relations between the society and nature as an interaction between part and whole.

Nature exerts a diverse influence on social life. Under its impact and with a view to its consequences, people themselves exert

an active and deliberate influence on the elemental forces of nature, channelling these along the required lines. Naturally, the character of that reciprocal influence depends on the level of science and material social production, on the social conditions, which determine the purpose of man's use of nature: in order to benefit the society as a whole (as under socialism) or only to meet the private interests of groups and individuals (as under capitalism, whose main law has been and remains the private-property law of maximising profit).

Ecological problems: their causes and effects. With the development of the society, the sphere of its active influence on nature has been expanding. The connection between the natural and social conditions of human existence is ever closer. That is evident from the numerous ecological problems, which have recently taken a much graver turn against the background of the general economic and social crisis of capitalism.

These problems have now acquired truly global dimensions, for they affect not only the highly developed capitalist countries, but also the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, whose natural resources continue to be ruthlessly exploited by the West with the use of neocolonialist methods. Soil erosion, pollution of rivers, lakes and seas and of the World Ocean itself, poisonous industrial waste killing plants and animals, extermination of rare species of animals (crocodiles, turtles, etc.) to meet the whims of the capitalist fashion market—all these are the results of an inhuman attitude to nature and lead to a serious worsening of the ecological situation in the world.

It is only natural, therefore, that ever more people in the West as well have been urging the need to eliminate the threat of an ecological catastrophe (including that connected with the stockpiling of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons). The movements for the right to life, for peace on the Earth, and in defence of the environment are becoming a major universal factor of political life. In the USA, Britain, the FRG and other countries, these movements have engendered independent political parties, which denounce the arms drive of the bourgeois states and are against the stockpiling of lethal nuclear weapons. These movements also help to draw the attention of broad strata in their countries to the need to combat the shortsighted ecological policy of the capitalist states.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always come out against the arms race, for general and complete disarmament. Mankind has no other reasonable alternative for the future except peaceful coexistence. It is only in the conditions of peaceful cooperation between states with different social systems that major steps can also be taken to a rational practical solution of the ecological problems of our day.

A rational solution of these problems, just as their emergence, has definite political and social prerequisites and consequences. Under socialism man's conscious efforts to protect nature make it possible to maintain and keep multiplying its resources, while the plunderous capitalist exploitation of nature dictated by an urge to maximise profit inevitably leads to its extermination and upsets the ecological equilibrium. That often has negative social consequences, worsening the people's health by way of pollution of the environment, crop failures, food shortages, etc. Under the capitalist system, many of these problems keep getting worse.

Population. The main productive force of the society is man himself. Unravelling the mysteries of nature and transforming nature and the society in the course of his labour activity, man also exerts a direct influence on the production and reproduction of his own life.

The population's growth rate, composition and density change with the development of the society. Changes in the birth rate, the overall rate of population growth, the density of the population, its age structure, and other demographic factors entail definite changes in the economic, political and other spheres of the society's life. So, the population influences the society's life as a whole. At the same time, social conditions can also exert (and often do exert) a direct influence on population growth. In other words, there is a close bilateral connection between social development and the population.

Mankind's history shows that social development paves the way for faster population growth. The accelerating growth of the world's population is directly dependent on the development of material social production: the replacement of old modes of production with new and more progressive ones usually entails an increase in the rate of population growth.

Here is how the population of the Earth has grown in differ-

ent historical periods. At the beginning of the Low Paleolithic period, the population of the Earth was around 100,000-200,000, rising to about one million by the beginning of the Upper Paleolithic period, to 10 million by the beginning of the Neolithic period (before the transition to cropping) and to 50 million by the end of that period (after the transition to cropping). At the beginning of our era the figure was 230 million, reaching 1 billion at the beginning of the 19th century, 2 billion by 1930, 3 billion by 1961, and 4 billion by 1976. At the beginning of 1984, the figure was 4.7 billion. In the 1970s, the population's growth rate went up to 2 per cent a year, which could be described as a population explosion.

Back in the 19th century, the British economist and clergyman Thomas R. Malthus formulated his "law" asserting an imbalance between population growth and the production of the means of subsistence. Malthus claimed that population growth always tends to outrun the growth of material production, causing many of mankind's afflictions: unemployment, poverty, hunger and material privation. The only way to avert these misfortunes, he believed, was to impose rigid control over the birth rate among the "lower classes" and limit the growth of the working population.

Later on, bourgeois ideologues turned the Malthusian doctrine into an instrument of their pseudo-scientific apologetics of economic and social inequality under capitalism, using it to obscure the aggressive ambitions of neocolonialism and the ruthless exploitation of the natural and manpower resources of the developing countries. Present-day Malthusians urge the need to minimise population growth in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, straining to prove that this could prevent the emergence of new millions of unemployed, hungry and homeless. In the guise of family planning, projects to regulate population growth rates, etc., the neo-Malthusians have been trying to push through racist and inhuman ideas.

The Malthusian doctrine was invalidated back in the 19th century by the founders of scientific communism, who showed that it is not a population surplus that puts pressure on social production, but that, on the contrary, the development of the productive forces under capitalism creates an army of "redundant" people. Marx saw such a dependence as the law of popu-

lation intrinsic to capitalism. Revealing the socio-economic prerequisites of the operation of that law, he scientifically substantiated the conclusion that population growth in the society is determined by the totality of the concrete historical conditions of its development.

That conclusion is confirmed by the present demographic situation in the world. The final third of the 20th century has become a period of unprecedented population growth on the planet as a result of a drop in mortality and a rise in the birth rate, mostly in the developing countries, which account for 90 per cent of the total population growth. The UN World Conference on Population at a governmental level, held in Mexico City in August 1984, expressed extreme concern over the imbalance between population growth, the planet's resources and the state of its ecology. It was noted that almost one billion people in the world were already suffering from hunger and malnutrition, and that by the end of the century, when the planet's population reached 6.1 billion, only one-half of all the developing countries would be able to feed their population. One of the causes of such a state of affairs is the economic dependence of these states on their former metropolitan countries and, as a result of that dependence, the extremely poor and lopsided development of their productive forces.

In the conditions of social change, which accelerated once these countries rose to political independence, the development of the productive forces continued to lag behind population growth. That called for a special population policy to regulate that growth, a policy which has already been adopted by about 40 Asian and African states. But the birth control measures adopted under that policy naturally cannot resolve the grave population problems. As the participants in the World Conference unanimously recognised, these problems should be solved in the context of the concrete economic and political conditions of each country.

The population is a factor of social development, although it is not decisive. Its growth rate and density can markedly facilitate or obstruct social development. Thus, low density could mean a slower growth of economic ties, inadequate division of labour, and a less than full development of the natural resources of some regions. A high density, on the other hand, creates prerequisites

for an intensification of production, division of labour, etc., but it could also cause underuse of manpower resources. In each particular case, the development level of production is determined by the nature of the social system, and not only by the density of the population. Population growth does not in itself determine the course of social development.

To sum up, nature, the geographical environment and the population factor constitute the necessary conditions of human life and production activity. These conditions are a constant two-way link between nature and man, between nature and the society, close and indissoluble: just as nature is a necessary prerequisite of the human society, remaining its necessary component, so the society itself is a part of the natural world.

So, while constituting the necessary and ever-present natural material conditions of human life in the society, the geographical environment and population growth are not the crucial factors of social development. Such a factor, or prerequisite, is the production of material values.

2. PRODUCTION

People's material production activity aimed at meeting their vital needs is seen by Marxist social theory as the starting point of human life in the society.

Marx and Engels showed in *The German Ideology* that the production of material values by people is not confined to meeting their vital needs, but also involves a reproduction of their mode of life as a whole. They explained the importance of production activity for the moulding and development of man himself as a social being. They tied in their understanding of man's social nature with the view of material production as a special type of activity which forms the basis for the whole range of relations that unite people and constitute the society.[1]

Later on, in analysing the uniformities regulating these relations in his *Capital,* Marx brought out the main prerequisites, which are rooted in the development uniformities of the process of material social production. He showed how socio-economic, ideological and other relations emerge and develop from that pro-

[1] See Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, p. 31.

cess, giving rise to historically conditioned types of social organisation. As he deepened and elaborated one of the basic categories of scientific social theory, the category of the mode of production, Marx started from the unity of the relations and conditions of material social production.

Mode of production. This category is central to Marxist social theory and is therefore closely connected with its other categories. To understand it, one should turn to such key concepts of Marxist social theory as labour, the objects and means of labour, material production (or the production of material values), the instruments and means of production, the productive forces, and the relations of production. The initial concept here is labour, and that is where we shall begin.

As it was explained above, it was labour which enabled man to stand out from nature. People meet their prime wants in food, clothes and housing by means of labour. Nature cannot supply them with the necessary material values in ready-made form. In order to obtain these values, it is necessary to produce them, and that requires labour.

That is why labour is one of man's prime wants.

What is labour? It is a process in which human activity mediates, regulates and controls the metabolism between man and nature. Acting on natural objects in a purposeful way, man transforms them.

Even the gathering of fruits, which are given to man by nature in "ready-made form", hunting, fishing, etc., are part of the mutual exchange between man and nature, a process in which man acts upon nature and transforms its conditions. The initial elements of that process are:

—first, *labour itself as purposeful human activity;*

—second, the *objects of labour,* i.e., the objects at which human activity is directed, the part of nature that is used by man for obtaining the required product; by extracting the substance to be processed in the course of labour, man himself *creates* the object of his labour (thus, metal, wood and fibre are objects of labour because a definite amount of labour has already been spent on them);

—third, the *means of labour,* the most important among which are the *instruments* of labour by means of which man performs labour and acts upon the object of his labour.

The objects and means of labour are the *material elements* of the labour process. In their totality, they constitute the *means of production.*

Material production is the area of social life in which people work to create the material product that goes either into collective or into personal use.

The production of material values is a process in which many diverse types of human labour activity interact with each other. After all, even in order to make a fairly simple device or to obtain a product that is yielded by nature with relative ease (like fish, game or fruit), it is often necessary to coordinate the knowledge, skills, experience and results of the labour of many people. It is impossible to sow, raise, harvest and preserve a crop without the simplest implements, which are made by some people and used in their labour activity by others. Any type of material production is marked by a division of functions, by specialisation. So, associating and concentrating the most diverse forms of human labour activity, material production provides the basis for the society.

In the production of material values, as it was noted above, people interact with nature. That interaction creates the society's productive forces.

The productive forces are the means of production and the people themselves who in the course of the labour process act upon nature and transform it, simultaneously developing and perfecting the means of production. People are the main element of the material productive forces. They have production experience and labour skills, which they keep perfecting and enriching in the process of their production activity. In that way, they also increase the productive power of their labour, with a simultaneous development of their own creative potential.

The human factor is the crucial element of the productive forces and should never be underestimated, for production is a social process and exists for human beings, is created by them, develops owing to their knowledge, skills and experience, owing to their multifaceted day-to-day labour activity. In the course of that process, people also interact between themselves, and that interaction gives rise to the relations of production.

The relations of production are a complicated system of diverse ties, which take shape between people in the course of

their joint labour activity. These include not only people's relations to the means of production, but also their relations among themselves determined by each individual's status in the system of material production characteristic of the given society. Apart from that, the relations of production also include the ties arising between people in the production of material values, their exchange, distribution and consumption; they also include the relations between producers that stem from the specialisation of their joint labour activity—from the *division of labour* between producers.

So, the *relations of production are a totality of the material economic relations between people in the process of production and the relations which characterise the movement of the social product from production to consumption.* All these relations *depend on the form of property in the means of production.*

What does "form of property" signify in this context? It is a definite *mode of appropriation* by people of the means of production themselves and, consequently, of the results of labour. In any society, production relations are based on a definite form of property, which determines the nature of the functioning and development of the production relations system as a whole. The status of each particular individual in the system of production relations also depends on who owns the means of production.

The owner of land or any other private property(factories, plants, workshops, banks, etc.) has an essentially different status as compared with that of the worker, engineer, technician, etc., who sell their labour-power to those who own the means of production. So, the relation to property in the means of production engenders the objectively existing distinctions in people's social status, in their relations to each other in the society, and in the nature of the social system as a whole.

Under *private property* in the means of production, most of the participants in material social production, deprived of the means of production, are in a state of dependence (non-economic or economic) on a handful of those who own the natural resources, plants, factories, banks, shops, and other means of production.

Mankind's history has known several different forms of private property: slaveholding, feudal and capitalist.

Social property in the means of production, on the contrary, is collective appropriation by people of the means of production;

hence the equal relations of all those involved in production, of all the society's members to the material conditions of their labour activity. Social forms of property include:

—group property, which existed in the epoch of the primitive commune;

—the whole people's (state) socialist property and cooperative socialist property, which belongs to work collectives.

One single communist property in the means of production—the property of the future—is the highest type of social property.

So, the social and private forms of property are the two basic forms of economic relations between people in the society. Historically, each of these two forms manifests itself in the specific mode of the conjugation of producers with the means of production that is peculiar to each particular epoch.

To understand its specifics, let us go over some of the peculiarities stemming from the form of property in the means of production and characterising production relations in each historical epoch.

The specifics of the *slaveholding relations of production* was that the means of labour and the working individual (the slave) were the property of one and the same owner. The means of labour and the producer-slave were both seen by the slave-owner as equal objects of property, or things.

Feudal production relations, based on property in big landed estates, were relations under which the peasants were exploited by the feudal lord, the owner of the land. The peasants were obliged to work on the feudal lord's land without remuneration or to pay him regular taxes or rent.

Capitalist production relations are based on private property in the basic means of production (enterprises, mines, etc.). Under capitalism, where the producers are no longer personally dependent, but are free, they are obliged to sell their labour-power in order to obtain means of subsistence. The owner of the means of production—the capitalist—buys their labour-power as a commodity and seeks to make the utmost use of it in order to extract profit. So, on the one hand, the producer gains access to the means of labour, by conjugating with which he joins in the process of production. On the other hand, the employer is enabled to pocket the surplus-value (profit), which labour-power is able

to produce over and above its own value and which the capitalist appropriates without remuneration.

The situation changes radically with the elimination of antagonistic production relations. That is only possible under social property in the means of production, which is characteristic of *communist production relations and their first, socialist phase.* As it lays the foundation of the essentially new type of production relations, socialism eliminates man's exploitation of man and the conditions for the existence of social classes which live by appropriating the results of the labour of others. At the same time, under socialist economic relations, the distinctions between the two main toiling classes—the working class and the peasantry—do not disappear altogether. They remain, for socialism cannot overcome right away the existing distinctions between the two forms of social property in the means of production (state and cooperative). They will be gradually erased as developed socialism advances towards communism.

History shows that the development of production—of each particular mode of production as a totality of its constituent productive forces and relations of production—is determined by the form of property. In its advance from the primitive-communal to the slaveholding society, and then on to feudalism, capitalism and eventually to communism, mankind's history is a succession of definite modes of production, which is based on a succession of corresponding forms of property in the means of production. Real history has also known many transitional forms of the organisation of economic life, combining vestiges of obsolete, outgoing forms of property (and corresponding modes of production) with new, ascendant forms. The struggle between these reflects the dialectics of the succession of modes of production and mankind's social development.

The mode of production is always a concrete historical unity of the productive forces and the relations of production. The productive forces and the relations of production characterise any mode of production as its two indissoluble aspects. It is not right, therefore, to examine a mode of production solely on the strength of its productive forces or its relations of production. An accentuation of the development of the productive forces (with emphasis on technology and the predominant type of labour: manual, machine or automated) tends to obscure the social content

of the production process. In that instance ("technological determinism" conceptions), the succession of modes of production is seen as a process determined solely by technical progress, by the development of technology. On the other hand, an exaggeration of the role of production relations in the replacement of one mode of production by another distorts the objective dialectics of that process (thus, right-wing reformism uses that trick in its efforts to prove the possibility of an evolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism through a gradual restructuring of capitalist production relations into socialist ones). Both the former and the latter conceptions are basically wrong.

It is simply impossible to restructure production relations without changes in the society's productive forces, which exert a definitive influence on these relations, just as it is impossible to go over from one socio-economic system to another without a change of the predominant mode of production. That objective dialectical dependence of the relations of production on the development of the productive forces is expressed in the *law of correspondence of the relations of production to the nature and development level of the productive forces.*

According to that law, production relations take shape and change under the definitive influence of the society's productive forces. It can be used in analysing the mode of production of any epoch, and shows the interaction of its constituent productive forces and relations of production, an interaction which marks the whole of mankind's history. That is why it is a *sociological law,* or a law which brings out the most general, objectively existing ties and relations, which do not depend either on people's intentions or on their will and consciousness, and which determine the dependence of the relations of production on the society's productive forces.

How does that law operate?

As we get down to its examination, let us primarily note that any mode of production develops in virtue of its own, intrinsic causes on the basis of internal dialectics adequate to that mode of production. That dialectics is determined by a combination of numerous conditions and factors: satisfaction of the people's vital requirements and a growth of these requirements, changes in the conditions of human existence, emergence of new material and cultural requirements with the development and perfection

of the production process itself, since production, just as the society, does not stand still.

Development of production is a law of social life. The society changes with the development of production, with the replacement of one mode of production by another and more perfect one. The process starts with changes in the productive forces, primarily the perfection of the instruments of production, whose development serves to increase labour productivity.

But the development of the productive forces is not confined to technical progress. As they perfect technical facilities in the process of production, people also change their relations in the production and distribution of material values. Thus, changes in the productive forces give rise to definite new relations of production, which correspond most of all to the level and nature of the given productive forces.

Having arisen in the entrails of slavery, feudal property relations engendered a corresponding type of production relations, based on the vassal's personal dependence on the feudal lord.

Later on, capitalist industrial manufacture emerged and developed in the entrails of feudalism, with a corresponding development of capitalist relations of production. As capitalism develops, the socialisation and concentration of production inevitably serve to deepen the contradictions between the rapidly developing productive forces and the ever more incongruous relations of production. That is the reason for the breakdown of the existing and the formation of qualitatively new relations between people in the sphere of the production and distribution of material values.

So, production relations emerge on the basis of definite productive forces, exerting an active reciprocal influence on these forces. Progressive production relations which correspond to the given productive forces help to accelerate the development of the productive forces themselves and thereby of material production as a whole, raising its efficiency. Obsolete relations of production, on the contrary, trammel and slow down the development of the productive forces.

The correspondence of the relations of production to the level and nature of the productive forces is violated with the development of any mode of production based on private property and exploitation. The discrepancy there is caused by the contradic-

tions between the relatively mobile productive forces and the relations of production, which usually lag behind and obstruct the development of the former. As the contradictions between them deepen, it becomes necessary to restructure the old social organisation, within whose framework these contradictions develop into a conflict: hence the need for a social revolution, which destroys the old relations of production and establishes new ones.

In summing up, let us note that:

—production of the material values necessary for human life is the starting point of the society, its functioning as an integral social organism and its development;

—the process of material production is a necessary condition of interaction between people in the course of their joint, social life;

—that process is the crucial, fundamental prerequisite for a perfection of the means of production, for a development of the productive forces and the relations of production, through which people not only act upon nature in the course of their joint labour activity, but also change the conditions of their social life.

3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORMATION

Having examined the dialectics of the mode of production of material values as the main, crucial factor in the society's development, let us now turn to the uniformities of the influence exerted by the mode of production on social life.

In order to understand and explain any social phenomenon, one should assume that each of these phenomena is engendered by definite social requirements and serves to meet these requirements. And since the society in which people live and work, their way of life are determined by the mode of production of material values, the phenomena engendered by the society also ultimately depend in their development on the mode of production peculiar to that society. So, the mode of production is the society's material, economic basis; it determines the interaction of the various spheres of the society as an integral social organism, as a social system which changes and develops in accordance with the objective prerequisites and conditions stemming from the specific features of the mode of production itself.

Marx proved that the key to understanding the society as a unity of the various aspects of its economic, social and cultural life lies in an analysis of the origination and development of the mode of production of material values and of the production relations connected with it, which make up the society's economic structure (*basis*), above which there rises a whole system of ideological relations, organisations and institutions (*superstructure*).

The totality of relations forming the society's basis and superstructure was designated by Marx as "socio-economic formation". He used the term "formation" not only to designate the unity of the relations constituting the society, but also to single out definite modes of production and successive historical epochs, types of society, definite stages of social development.

Marx's concept of "socio-economic formation" was the key to a scientific explanation of the *unity* of the various aspects of social life. At the same time, it made it possible to explain the *continuity* of the socio-historical process, its law-governed progressive nature. Together with the other categories and concepts of Marxist social theory, the concept of "socio-economic formation" is an instrument in the scientific analysis of the motive forces of human history.

So, let us give a definition of the socio-economic formation and examine the content of its initial components.

Socio-economic formation is a definite type of society; it is an integral social system which functions and develops in accordance with its intrinsic, specific laws, on the basis of the mode of production that exists in the given society.

Historically conditioned relations of production constitute the economic basis of each formation. The totality of these relations, i.e., the various forms of property, the relations between people in the process of production stemming from these, and also the forms of exchange, distribution and consumption of the means of subsistence, constitutes the economic structure of the society, its basis. Each society has its own type of basis, which is determined by the type of production relations, and these, for their part, depend on the state of the society's productive forces.

The economic basis arises from the society's definite material conditions, from its productive forces. Its importance in the life of the society is hard to overestimate: it exerts a decisive influence on the organisation of production, and also on the distribu-

tion of material values. Simultaneously, the basis provides a real foundation for the society's ideological superstructure.

The superstructure is the totality of the legal, political, philosophical, religious, ethical, aesthetic and other views existing in a given society and the relations, organisations and institutions corresponding to these views.

These social relations, ideas and institutions arise from the society's economic basis, so that the superstructure as a whole is determined by that basis, by the initial economic relations of the society, relations which exist in the sphere of material social production. Consequently, the society's complexion, its spiritual life, its politics, morality, law, etc., primarily depend on the nature of the social relations that constitute the society's economic structure, or its basis.

The dialectics of the basis and superstructure. The predominant political, legal, religious, philosophical, ethical and aesthetic views (and also the relations connected with these and the institutions which regulate these relations) depend on the type of the society's economic basis. If the economic basis hinges on antagonistic production relations, which enable the social classes that own the means of production to exploit the other, toiling classes and appropriate the results of their labour, the ideological institutions and the views themselves (and so the superstructural relations as a whole) will also in one form or another reflect the contradictions of the basis.

The economic, political and spiritual life of any antagonistic socio-economic formation (be it slavery, feudalism or capitalism) shows how the basis influences the superstructure.

Let us examine some manifestations of that influence.

Under *slavery* (as in Ancient Greece or Rome), the society's division into two basic antagonistic classes—the class of slaves and the class of slave-owners—entailed a struggle between the interests of these classes in such spheres of life as ideology, politics, religion, philosophy, poetry and art. Ancient philosophy and literature testify to a confrontation and struggle between the ideological views of the various social groups and classes of that epoch, whose interests clashed in the economic, political, social and other spheres.

Under *feudalism,* which came to replace the slaveholding system and under which the society was divided into the basic

classes of landowners (feudal lords, landlords) and peasants, who were in bondage to the former and were engaged in small-scale individual farming on the land of the feudal lords, the predominant economic relations were reflected in the sway of religious ideology, conservative and patriarchal views in such areas as ethics, collective psychology and art, in the political ideology of nationalism, traditionalism, etc. The views prevailing under feudalism survive in vestigial form even after that socio-economic formation gives way to the capitalist formation, with its own economic structure, its own economic and ideological relations.

In the capitalist society, vestiges of feudalism survive primarily because capitalism inherits some of the feudal economic institutions and relations (connected with latifundia, the labour-rent system, metayage, etc.). These vestiges are still in evidence in many developing countries, which have only recently taken the road of independent economic and political development. Survivals of feudalism are also to be found in some economically developed countries of Europe (Spain, Portugal, Italy), and Latin America.

Under *capitalism,* the last antagonistic socio-economic formation, based on private property in the means of production, on the exploitation of wage-labour (industrial and agricultural workers, employees, etc.) by the class of capitalists, the owners of the means of production, the *basic contradiction manifests itself as a contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation,* and is expressed in recurrent economic crises and chronic unemployment.

The relations of the economic basis are shot through with sharp class antagonisms between labour (those who work) and capital (those who appropriate the results of that work). Concentration of capital, the rule of the monopolies and the financial oligarchy in economic life, intensifying reaction in politics, overtly anti-popular, anti-democratic tendencies in ideology and cultural life—such is the real influence of the basis on the superstructure under capitalism. Doing its utmost to stunt the progressive shoots in ideology, politics and culture, the ruling elite of the capitalist society encourages openly decadent views and conceptions. By seeking to substantiate the possibility of thermonuclear war, endorsing international terrorism, sponsoring extremist right-wing movements, and installing obedient political regimes with the help of armed force, the ruling classes of the USA and other

leading capitalist states hope to protect the vital economic interests of the capitalists, and to prolong the existence of the political system which is doomed by history.

Under *socialism*—the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation, a new type of formation—socialist superstructural relations and institutions (the state, the political organisations of the working people led by their communist parties) help to accelerate the development of material production, to optimise all the units of the national economic mechanism, to develop the scientific and technical creativity of the masses and, on that basis, steadily to raise the people's living standards and meet the material and spiritual requirements of each member of the society to an ever fuller extent.

So, the interconnection between the basis and the superstructure is a *dialectical* one. Arising from a definite basis, the corresponding superstructure helps to maintain and strengthen the economic domination of the social forces that own the means of production, something which results in their domination in the sphere of nonmaterial production (ideology, politics, religion, morality, and various spheres of the production of spiritual and cultural values). While reflecting the basis, the superstructure also registers its contradictions. In antagonistic formations (as under capitalism), that is reflected in the contradictions between the state and the revolutionary mood of the masses, in the struggle between the ideologies of different classes, in the different and sometimes antithetical political platforms of various parties, etc.

Changes in the economic basis (either a deepening or a resolution of its contradictions) inevitably entail changes in diverse superstructural relations and institutions. The break-up of obsolete production relations and a destruction of the related form of property in the means of production (as in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism), signifies a break-up of the economic and social system as a whole, that is, a change of the socio-economic formation, and amounts to a radical revolution in the superstructure.

In elaborating that question, the founders of Marxist social theory showed that a transformation of the society's system of superstructural relations and institutions takes time and calls for definite conditions. In the conditions of the transition period, when a new type of economic structure, a new basis takes shape,

there also arises a political superstructure which corresponds to these conditions. It is necessary to complete the political, social and cultural transformations and to put down the resistance of the overthrown ruling classes. During the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, such a historically necessary form of the working masses' political power is the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat (a concept to be examined later on). Such a state is a crucial and necessary condition for the gradual transformation of the whole superstructure inherited from the past in accordance with the new economic basis.

The content of the political and ideological superstructure depends on the economic basis and is determined by it. But does this mean that the superstructure is "tied" to its economic basis and cannot function independently? Not at all. The superstructure is *relatively independent* with regard to its economic basis, which is yet another manifestation of the dialectical nature of that dependence.

Many non-Marxist philosophers and sociologists still present Marxist social theory as an "excessively monistic" doctrine, which allegedly seeks to explain the society through primitive economic interpretation (with an exaggeration of the role of the basis) and to substantiate "economic determinism" in a schematic way, so "oversimplifying" the complicated picture of social processes going forward in the economic, political, cultural and other spheres of social life in our day.[1]

Such views are totally unwarranted. They are based on biased and one-sided notions about Marxist social theory, on a neo-Kantian critique of Marxism. Distorting the actual content of the Marxist doctrine, these views in effect deny the need for a dialectical approach to studying the society as a unity of the various aspects of its life and reject the consistently materialist explanation of the interaction between the society's basis and superstructure.

Such views were already exposed by the founders of Marxist social theory. In a letter to W. Borgius, Engels wrote that historical materialism had never claimed that "the economic situation is *cause, and solely active*, whereas everything else is only passive

[1] See, for instance, Rigoberto Lanz, *Marxismo y sociologia,* Parauna critica de la sociologia marxista. Fontanamara, Barcelona, 1981.

effect. On the contrary, interaction takes place on the basis of economic necessity, which *ultimately* always asserts itself".[1]

The basis affects the superstructure through a ramified system of intermediate links which exist between the economy and the various forms of ideology, through the connection between the economic and political interests of people belonging to definite social classes. After all, it is none other than people who transform the economic relations of the basis, who carry out revolutions, so also transforming the superstructure. Consequently, the latter's dependence on changes in the basis cannot be reduced solely to economic causes: the interaction between the various elements of the superstructure itself often entails effects which are not conditioned by the economic basis.

So, the superstructure is an active force which influences diverse processes and phenomena in the society, including its economic basis, a force which protects and strengthens the economic relations existing on that basis, and which helps to perfect and develop them.

The growing role of the superstructure in countries with different economic and political systems is due to different causes.

Under capitalism, the propertied ruling classes seek to retain their predominant economic position, invigorating their ideological and political influence on the working masses, on their consciousness, and aiming either to slow down or to "neutralise" the development of the anti-imperialist forces, the national liberation and working-class movement, for these forces pose a real threat to the existence of capitalism, based on the exploitation of the rightless working millions.

Under socialism, on the contrary, the active role of the superstructure with regard to the basis is a constructive factor in the transformation of the society and its all-round development in the interests of the working masses, who take an active part in running production and who shape the new social relations.

By strengthening the socialist basis, the superstructure under socialism helps to build the new society. Socialism by its very nature is a form of the organisation of social life which implies each individual's ever broader and conscious involvement in ad-

[1] "Engels to W. Borgius in Breslau, January 25, 1894", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 442.

ministration and management, in perfecting and developing production. It is no longer the sway of the capitalist market, but balanced use of the potentialities inherent in the socialist economy that creates the necessary prerequisites for a *decisive influence* of the socialist superstructure on the basis.

The activity of the superstructure under socialism is just as distinct from the activity of the capitalist superstructure (or any other connected with antagonistic formations) as the economic relations of the basis under socialism are distinct from those of any other social system.

In summing up the above, particularly the question of the basis and superstructure as the two main structural elements of any formation, let us note that these two elements not only characterise each socio-economic formation, but also distinguish one from another. It is precisely the basis and the superstructure that make it possible to see the peculiarity of a socio-economic formation as an independent social organism and to understand the internal laws of its progressive development.

At the same time, the socio-economic formation includes a whole range of other entities (historical forms of human community, the state, etc.), the most important of which we shall consider in subsequent sections.

The succession of socio-economic formations and the society's development. By showing the inherent unity of social life and bringing out its material foundations, Marxism put an end to the various idealistic and metaphysical views on the problem of social development which had prevailed in the historical and social sciences up to the emergence of the materialist understanding of history.

The view of society as a concrete historical society at a definite stage of its historical development became possible when it came to be seen as a developing unity of the diverse aspects and relations of joint human life, or as a socio-economic formation. Marx and Engels first realised that the peculiarity of any particular type of society and the laws of its change and development should be explained on the strictly scientific foundation of an all-round historico-materialist analysis of the diversity of social phenomena. That enabled them to single out the recurrent and essential elements in the society's development, to trace the succession of formations as a natural-historical process.

The concept of socio-economic formations enabled the founders of historical materialism to elaborate a consistently scientific periodisation of the succession of epochs in mankind's social development. These successive epochs of world history, as described above, include the (1) primitive-communal, (2) slaveholding, (3)feudal, (4) capitalist and (5) communist socio-economic formations.

The conception of the society's development as a succession of formations for the first time enabled Marx and Engels to see history as *one process of mankind's advance from lower to higher stages,* to establish the continuity of that process.

Historical materialism examines the continuity in the society's development on the strength of the objective prerequisites and conditions of that development, inherent in the definite *sequence* of definite modes of production. While connecting the succession of socio-economic formations with a succession of the modes of production that predominate in each epoch, Marxism does not deny *the progressive nature* of the society's historical development within the framework of each formation. Nor does it reduce its explanation of history to any "monocausal" schemes or "economic determinism", as non-Marxist philosophers and sociologists often allege. Its harmonious and perfectly lucid explanation of the historical process as a succession of formations has nothing to do with idealistic interpretations of history, which are far from an adequate comprehension of the actual processes unfolding in the society's life and its development.

So, one could note that:

—socio-economic formations are historically definite types of society;

—the formation is a unity of the basis and the superstructure;

—a many-sided dialectical interconnection exists between the material economic relations constituting the basis and the ideological relations constituting the superstructure;

—the society's complexion is primarily determined by the character of the relations of its economic basis;

—correspondence of the superstructure to the given basis is a uniformity of the interaction between the basis and the superstructure;

—however, that does not rule out a relative independence of the ideological and political institutions and relations rising

above the given basis and constituting the superstructure of each historically concrete type of society;

—through diverse links which mediate the interaction between the economy, on the one hand, and ideology, politics and spiritual life, on the other, the superstructure can exert an active influence on the basis, and through it on the development of the society as a whole, either accelerating or holding back its progress;

—the society's advance from lower to higher stages of development is based on a succession of socio-economic formations.

4. HISTORY: DIVERSITY AND UNITY

Historical materialism traces the succession of socio-economic formations as a general law-governed tendency in mankind's development: from one stage to another, in the unity and integrity of that process, without ruling out peculiarities and specific features in the development of individual peoples, countries and continents.

The historical development of each country has its own specifics, which are primarily due to differing economic, political, social and cultural levels, and these, in turn, result from the unevenness of the development process as a whole.

Different countries and peoples can enter one and the same socio-economic formation under far from similar conditions and at different points in time. Although the history of all countries and peoples without exception has always developed and continues to develop as a transition from lower to higher social stages, the transition of each of these countries and peoples has its own specific features. In the course of historical development, some peoples went over from the tribal system to the slaveholding system, others (Germanic and Slavic tribes) bypassed the latter and went over straight to feudalism; and still others (like the Mongolian People's Republic and some Central Asian peoples on the territory of the Soviet Union) bypassed capitalism and went over from age-old semi-feudal structures to building the foundations of socialism. They were enabled to do so by the support and assistance they received from other, more developed neighbouring peoples, primarily the peoples of Soviet Russia.

The last few decades of the 20th century have seen many

countries and peoples go over from one economic and social set-up to another and more progressive one. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia marked the beginning of the end of capitalism as a world socio-economic system, giving a powerful impulse to the social development of different countries and peoples. After the Second World War, many Asian, African and Latin American countries and peoples rose to freedom in the course of a powerful national liberation movement and took the road of independent political and economic development. The newly free countries differ markedly both in economic development levels and in national and cultural traditions, ethnic structures, etc. For many of them, the crucial problem now is to resolve the economic and social contradictions inherited from the past, eliminate the age-old backwardness and dependence, root out the aftermath of colonialism, etc.

Ever more countries are choosing the road of socialist construction. They are united by a resolve to end their semi-colonial dependence on the imperialist Western powers, by their efforts to establish an independent economic basis, to accelerate development of those branches of the economy which are particularly important in strengthening the political and economic independence of the young national states in the international arena, and to transform the superstructure in accordance with the need for rapid growth, for a democratisation of political and social life, etc.

The development of the human society as a succession of formations is an integral and progressive process. In analysing that process, we should not, therefore, overlook those of its aspects which pave the way for a change of formation "from within", as the economic and social foundations of each formation take shape, grow, mature and become obsolete.

In order to understand the inner uniformities of that progressive process, let us take a closer look at the historical transition from one socio-economic formation to another.

From the primitive-communal to the slaveholding society. The emergence of the primitive-communal system and its gradual evolvement towards slavery lasted tens of thousands of years. In that period, man himself was formed in the course of labour activity (as he gathered fruit, hunted, fished, made and perfected primitive tools). The social form of property in the means of

production and corresponding production relations developed at that time. These were relations of mutual assistance, for men had to withstand the forces of nature, which were much more powerful than man himself with his primitive instruments of production.

As labour productivity increased with the perfection of tools and with the accumulation of human production experience, the number of products gradually increased, cropping and cattle-breeding branched out into separate types of production activity (the first major social division of labour), later on to be followed by the handicrafts (clothes-making, tool-making, etc.).

With the development of product exchange, the gentile commune disintegrated into separate families, which became the owners of the means of production. The increase in the amount of products entailed their unequal distribution and appropriation, and the society began to stratify and differentiate, as a result of which some people exploited the labour of others and enriched themselves at their expense. Since exchange developed together with the growth of production, economic and social inequality tended to deepen. The emergence of the classes of slaves and slave-owners with their antithetical interests meant a polarisation of the ancient society. So, the primitive-communal society gave way to slavery.

From the slaveholding to the feudal society. Under the slaveholding formation, the development of the productive forces was no longer solely connected with a perfection of tools, but also with a highly intensive use of cheap manual slave labour. The development of agriculture, mining, metallurgy, building and the handicrafts became possible owing to slave labour. Just as the slaves themselves, their labour was the property of the slave-owner, who owned the means of production. The slave received from his master the barest minimum of what was necessary to live and toil.

The relations of production under slavery were those of total subjugation of some people by others, with ruthless exploitation of the utterly rightless slaves by their masters. These relations were maintained and protected by the superstructure of the slaveholding society as represented by the slaveholding state with its repressive machine (its legal system, army, etc.), a superstructure which emerged from the economic basis to defend the in-

terests of the propertied class and its property. The development of the productive forces in that epoch made it necessary to raise labour productivity, but an objective obstacle there was the totally subordinate position of the slaves, who were the main productive force of the ancient society, but who had no stake in developing production.

The contradictions between the productive forces and the relations of production under slavery deepened with the ever worsening economic condition of the slaves. Slave uprisings rocked the foundations of the slaveholding state. The wars waged by the latter in order to maintain and multiply the wealth of its rulers, as well as the slave uprisings, ultimately undermined the very foundation of the slaveholding system. Its weakening and disintegration entailed the emergence of new economic structures, a new social organisation which entrenched the predominant position of the landowner, or the feudal lord, and the dependent position of the peasant, or the serf, who worked for his master.

The production relations of the new, feudal society were based on the feudal lord's total property in land and his partial property in the peasant, who was obliged to do labour service and pay duties, to work for his master, although he was also able to work for himself. The peasant had his own personal household and was interested in improving the methods of running it. The development of production, the handicrafts and trade was directly connected with the personal stake of those who did the actual work. New technical discoveries and inventions, the growth of the cities as the main centres of the handicrafts and trade helped to deepen the division of labour in the feudal society.

The whole feudal superstructure that stemmed from the economic basis of that society defended the private property of the landowners and the relations of production based on that form of property. In the feudal epoch, the state machine was fortified, the army swelled, and the church became the predominant ideological force, which fully controlled the society's spiritual life, the development of the sciences and education, and which defended and sustained the power of the propertied classes, and sanctified the monarchy.

The technical innovations and great geographical discoveries of the 15th and 16th centuries (the discovery of the sea route

to India, of the American continent, etc.) helped to develop the productive forces of the feudal society, which were in ever greater contradiction with the obviously lagging relations of production, especially in view of the development of manufactory production. The formation of an international market in that epoch also meant greater demand for various goods, which the handicrafts were no longer able to meet. By using more labourers and new technology, the manufactory sharply increased productivity and led to broader division of labour. With the emergence of manufactories, the number of labourers employed at these considerably increased. The new type of industrial production served to create a new social organisation, as two new and opposite classes began to take shape within the entrails of the feudal society: the bourgeoisie, which owned the means of production, and the proletariat, which sold its muscle-power, its labour-power to the former.

From the feudal to the capitalist society. Natural farming and the fact that the serf was bound to the land increasingly prevented the formation of a market of labour-power that was necessary to develop manufactory production. The productive forces of the feudal society clashed with the obsolete production relations. The new type of production necessitated a fundamental break-up of these relations.

As masses of peasants were ruined and the condition of the lower urban strata sharply deteriorated, they increasingly rose up against their oppressors. The bourgeoisie made use of that discontent and channelled it along lines that suited its own purposes. The transition from feudalism to the new capitalist formation was marked by numerous bourgeois revolutions, which undermined the economic, political and social organisation of feudalism at the very root. So, feudalism gradually gave way to capitalism.

The assertion of capitalism gave an unprecedented impulse to the development of the productive forces and accelerated historical development. Capitalism put a resolute end to the isolated economic and social life of the various peoples, states and continents. Seclusion and provincialism gave way to free exchange, to one global economic system and a world market.

Handicraft workshops and manufactories were replaced by large-scale machine production: gigantic plants, factories and

mines. Transport and the communications developed at a rapid pace. Millions of people were leaving their homes in search of a livelihood and moving to the industrial centres to swell the ranks of the proletarians.

The epoch of the rise and development of capitalist production changed the lives of the people to a greater extent than all the earlier epochs taken together.

But right from the very beginning, economic and social development under capitalism was marked by acute contradictions. On the one hand, there was socialisation of production, and on the other, there was private bourgeois property in the means of production and the related form of appropriation by the property owner (the capitalist) of the surplus-value, i.e., the unpaid labour of the workers. Concentration and centralisation of capitalist production, its rapid development went hand in hand with private competition, anarchy, overproduction and economic crises, and the relative freedom of the production worker, or the proletarian (freedom to sell his labour-power)—with his total economic dependence on the capitalist class, on the bourgeoisie, and his lack of social rights.

The production relations and the economic basic of the bourgeois society, marked by an antagonism between labour and capital, engendered a corresponding superstructure. The state, the army, the legal, ideological and political institutions of the bourgeois society, its philosophy, art, ethics and religion have always protected and continue to protect the interests of the propertied classes, asserting that private property is eternal and that the spirit of profit-making and capitalist exploitation is natural to man.

At the same time, one will also find in that society, in contrast to its official ideology of inequality and oppression, the shoots of a new world outlook, the outlook of the working class, which begins to understand the peculiarities of its economic and social position and which rises up in active struggle for its vital rights.

The drive for profit, which was the main incentive of capitalist progress, led to a rapid growth of the capitalist society's productive forces. But the drive for profit also led to the deepest contradiction of the capitalist mode of production: the contradiction between the social character of the production process itself and the private-capitalist form of appropriation, between the

growth potential of the productive forces and the production relations which obstruct that growth. By the end of the past century, capitalism had already gone through a number of stages and entered its highest and final stage: *imperialism*. Free competition gave way to domination by the *monopolies,* or big associations of capitalists which control the production and marketing of goods and dictate market prices, so ensuring maximum profits.

The monopoly stage of capitalism marks a further deepening of its basic contradictions and greater exploitation of the working people, both at home and in the dependent countries. In their drive for profit, the capitalist powers colonise the world, divide it into spheres of economic and political domination or influence, unleash wars, spark off numerous local conflicts, impose reactionary regimes on other peoples, spiral the arms race, and fan the war hysteria.

The imperialist circles and their ideologues have been doing their utmost to distract the working masses from the contradictions of daily life under capitalism, from its problems engendered by mass unemployment, continued poverty, rightlessness, national and social inequality, growing crime and violence, from the struggle for their vital rights.

These contradictions, however, can never be resolved through the demagogic promises of bourgeois politicians who call for "renewal" and reform, for the creation of a "fairer" social system. The class struggle between the forces of labour and capital inevitably leads to a resolution of these contradictions through socialist revolution, whose victory puts an end to capitalism as a social system and to the obsolete social relations.

A socialist revolution creates the initial prerequisites for the emergence of a qualitatively new type of society, which destroys private property in the means of production together with economic and social inequality, oppression, and man's exploitation of man.

So, a socialist revolution amounts to a transition from the antagonistic to the non-antagonistic type of social system.

Socialism as the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation. The socialist society is fundamentally different from the capitalist or any other society based on private property in the means of production, primarily in that it is free from such

relations between people as exploitation, dependence and economic domination, which stem from private property. Socialism engenders *social property in the means of production*. The objective prerequisites for it are "prepared" by capitalism itself, which creates big industry, concentrates control over economic life in the hands of the monopolies, makes it possible to use scientific and technical achievements in production, and socialises production.

Socialism, however, does not "stem" directly from capitalism. It emerges gradually, out of the radical revolutionary transformations in the economic basis and superstructure inherited from the old society. The period during which the old economic and social structures are transformed into new ones is called the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. It is a period of the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist society into a socialist one. It starts with the winning of political power by the working class and ends with the laying of the foundations of socialism.

Why is a transition period necessary?

Primarily because the new society is essentially antithetical to the old one: it does not emerge of its own accord, within the entrails of the capitalist system of exploitation. Socialism asserts itself only with the establishment of working-class power, when that power is used for the socialist reconstruction of the society (to eliminate the domination of private property relations in material production, to establish social property in the means of production and socialist social relations, and to strengthen these relations in transforming economic, political and cultural life).

The forms of such reconstruction can be highly diverse, depending on the concrete historical conditions of individual countries. In the USSR, for instance, the specifics of the transformations carried out in the transition period were determined not only by the country's technico-economic backwardness inherited from tsarist Russia, but also to a considerable extent by the capitalist surrounding and the fierce resistance of the overthrown classes, the capitalists and the landowners. In other socialist countries, these transformations took place or are still under way in much more favourable historical conditions. There is now a powerful world socialist system and multifaceted experience in laying the foundations of socialism in different historical condi-

tions, primarily the experience of the USSR. Any country taking the road of socialist transformations, however distant from the USSR, can always rely on its selfless and friendly support and assistance.

Under socialism, the development of production is wholly geared to meet the people's growing needs to the fullest possible extent and to perfect the socialist social relations. The productive forces under socialism develop in close dialectical unity with the relations of production. These relations, as we have already emphasised, are based on socialist social property in the means of production. These are relations of mutual assistance and equitable fraternal cooperation between people.

The right to work under socialism is not only proclaimed but is guaranteed for all. Every individual regards his work and its results as a source of accelerating the social transformations and improving various aspects of social life. The free labour of millions of people is their constructive, creative activity aimed at self-realisation, at bringing out the abilities of each member of the society. The individual's new attitude to work is one of the main achievements of socialism.

Production relations under socialism are being perfected in a steady and balanced way. Any working individual is able to take part in running production, and that is a reflection of the truly democratic nature of the new society.

The socialist society's superstructure also undergoes profound qualitative transformations. The world outlook and the revolutionary theory of the working class and its vanguard (the party) first emerge under capitalism. With the formation of the new and progressive socialist basis, the socialist superstructure, that is, the totality of its constituent ideological, political and other relations and institutions (primarily the socialist state, various political organisations led by the ruling communist party, the trade unions, cultural, educational and other bodies), tends to become monolithic and effectual.

With regard to its basis, the socialist superstructure performs diverse functions connected with the management of social production, its steady perfection, and the task of ensuring and protecting the interests of all the toiling classes. As they advance along the road of peace and progress towards a common goal, the friendly classes of the socialist society pool their efforts in

tackling the urgent tasks of consolidating their gains and making further headway in economic and cultural construction.

The fact that the USSR entered the stage of developed socialism indicates profound transformations in the economy and the whole system of social relations. The Soviet Union is still at the beginning of the historically protracted stage of developed socialism, but has already scored great successes in every field. Relying on the advantages of the new social system, it has a powerful and versatile economy and highly skilled workers, specialists and researchers.

Profound changes have taken place in social life. A guaranteed right to work and payment for work, the society's concern for the working man throughout his entire life, broad access to spiritual culture, respect for the dignity and rights of the individual, and the working people's ever broader involvement in running the socialist society are among the inalienable features of the socialist way of life.

At the same time, life itself dictates the need for further changes and transformations. In blazing a trail to communism, the fairest social system in history, as in any new endeavour, the society is bound to face certain difficulties, which can be overcome with the help of Marxism-Leninism, the dialectico-materialist world outlook. The society of real socialism keeps striving for accelerating economic and social development, for a scientific and technical renewal of production, seeks to attain the highest world level of labour productivity, to perfect social, primarily economic relations, to effect deep-going changes in the material and spiritual conditions of human life, to invigorate the whole system of political and social institutions, and to deepen socialist democracy, self-government by the people.

The improvement of socialism in the USSR is aimed at achieving, in a historical perspective, of the second phase of the communist socio-economic formation—communism. The classless communist society is to perform a great historical task: once and for all, it is to free every single individual, all people on the Earth from any form of oppression, social inequality and exploitation, from the threat of war on the planet. Once it attains the highest level of material production and spiritual culture, the communist society will create all the conditions for the fullest and all-round development of the human individual; it will be-

come the first society of real humanism in mankind's long history.

The present epoch, whose content is mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, marks a step forward along the road to a classless communist society.

Marxist theory shows the diversity and unity of the historical process and explains its objective prerequisites in accordance with the conditions of economic, political and cultural development that characterise the level attained by each society within the framework of this or that formation.

History is seen as a succession of socio-economic formations: primitive-communal, slaveholding, feudal and capitalist. The latter—the last antagonistic formation—inevitably gives way to the communist formation.

Socialism is the first phase of the communist social system. Under socialism, the crucial prerequisites are created for a gradual transition to a communist society.

The transition from socialism to communism is a protracted historical process, which implies a perfection of all the aspects and relations of the new society.

5. THE MOTIVE FORCES OF HISTORY

Having determined that the development of the human society is a natural-historical process, a succession of socio-economic formations, let us now turn to the motive forces of social development.

That question is studied by the philosophy of history, a field of philosophy which seeks to explain the laws of history and to comprehend the process of historical cognition.

Pre-Marxist philosophy of history largely confined itself to essentially idealistic conceptions of the historical process. Since the Middle Ages, Christian philosophy of history was dominated by providentialism, or the view that a god (deity, providence) is the chief motive force of history, while man merely executes the supreme will.

In contrast to these theologico-religious notions, secular philosophy of history (starting from Aristotle to Abd-al-Rahman ibn-Khaldun, Giovanni Battista Vico, Charles Fourier and others) developed so-called theories of historical cycles, which explained social development by asserting a definite "order", a "natural re-

currence" in the life cycle of various cultures and civilisations, as they rise, reach their peak and decline.

In contrast to these theories, Hegel and the followers of his idealist philosophy emphasised the unity and continuity of history, seeing the motive force of history in the development of a world reason, infinite and eternal.

In the 19th century, these conceptions gave way to evolutionism, whose advocates, like Herbert Spencer regarded social development as a process of ceaseless growth, maturation and "perfection", similar to the processes unfolding in a biological organism.

Later on, bourgeois philosophy of history came up with other theories. One of their characteristic features was that none of them connected in any meaningful way the process of social development with the practical material-production activity of man himself or saw that activity as the point of departure for the historical changes in the society.

Marx and Engels showed the unsoundness of these views in their first two major works, *The Holy Family* and *The German Ideology,* in which they gave a full scientific refutation of the various idealistic views of history. They resolutely rejected those views of history which ignored the obvious fact that men themselves make their own history, that they are its architects. Marx and Engels showed that the socio-historical process is being effected by people themselves, who create material values in the course of their daily work, simultaneously perfecting the very process of production, developing the society's productive forces, and changing the relations of production. They pointed out that people do not make their history arbitrarily, but proceed in their activity from the objectively existing conditions, and that the results of the activity of each preceding generation are passed on to subsequent generations on the basis of a definite level of material production attained in the preceding epoch. The society's development was thus presented as a natural-historical process unfolding in accordance with definite historical laws, a process whose invariable source and driving power is the multifaceted day-to-day constructive activity of millions of working people, of the working masses, of the entire people.

The people: the concept defined. So, the working masses, the people as a whole are the main motive force of history, some-

thing that is hard to deny. In accepting that conclusion, however, one is bound to ask a number of inevitable questions.

First, what is "the people" as a concept?

Second, how does the leading role of the popular masses in history manifest itself?

Third, how do the popular masses influence the course of history?

Fourth, what is the correlation between mass action and the activities of individuals?

Fifth, what is the latter's role in history?

Marxist social theory answers each of these questions.

A great deal has been written about the role of the masses in social development, in history. There are numerous works on the historical action of the masses, including the so-called revolt of the masses (as the phenomenon was called by José Ortega y Gasset in his book *La Rebelión de las Masas*, published in 1930), the problems of the "mass society" and present-day capitalist "mass culture". In dealing with these problems, non-Marxist authors confine themselves to the general abstract concepts of "the people" and "the masses", without specifying their content. Many ideologues and theoreticians belonging to diverse nationalist trends (including openly right-wing, fascist-minded ones) appeal to the "national spirit" and the "national mentality", to the nation's "vital interests", etc. Present-day populism (both right and "left") also addresses "the people", the popular "masses". Many conservative-oriented theories of Catholicism and traditionalism, liberal elitist conceptions, etc., have also turned to the problems of leadership, of governing "the masses". There is a distinct connection between the attitude to the people, to the masses and the content of these concepts in the demagogic political and social doctrines expounded by the theorists of conservatism, nationalism, and anti-popular totalitarian regimes.

In exposing these doctrines and giving its own explanation of history and its motive forces, historical materialism rejects any attempts to play down the role of the masses in the process of social development.

A study of world history presents a vivid picture of changing epochs, wars and revolutions, of the rise and fall of states, cultures and whole civilisations. History has known many outstanding individuals, who have left their imprint on the events of the past.

Pre-Marxist historiography and philosophy often correlated the course of history solely with the names of military leaders, kings and emperors, forgetting that behind these names stands the real, though anonymous force of historical progress—the people, all those who contribute to the development of production by their daily labour, their skills and experience, who create material and spiritual values and pass them on from generation to generation, who revive, cherish and keep renewing the cultural legacy, experience, customs and traditions of the past.

Although the idealistic conceptions of history could not bring out that real force (which is due, in particular, to the conditions of social life under antagonistic formations, the oppression and downtroddenness of the masses, the fact that they had no access to politics, which was in the hands of the exploiter elite), it is precisely the people and their daily labour activity that constitute the basis of the historical process, its crucial motive force.

The people is not an amorphous, grey and featureless mass, a "mechanical" aggregation or a "mob", as the ideologues of the aristocracy and the ruling classes have often described it with disdain, deliberately underestimating its place in social life.

The people is a historical, concrete concept, for it cannot exist "outside" the society, "outside" history. It changes together with the society, whose requirements it works to meet, together with history, which develops owing to its daily constructive activity.

From the standpoint of historical materialism, the people consists of diverse strata, groups and classes, whose positions in the society differ. But in any case the people is primarily the working masses, the producers of material values.

Depending on the type of society and the historical conditions, the concrete content of the "working masses" and "people" concepts keeps changing. In an antagonistic society, the people primarily consists of the oppressed classes and strata, which confront the anti-popular exploiter elite and which make up the bulk of the population. All of these promote development and progressive changes in the society. That is why in definite historical conditions some non-toiling classes can join the people. At certain turning points in history (in revolutionary situations), some sections of the national bourgeoisie may join the people by taking part in social transformations and in the liberation struggle (anti-imperialist, anti-colonial).

So, the concept of "the people" can unite diverse groups, classes and strata, but only if the existing social contradictions between them are temporarily eased and recede into the background as compared with the more urgent tasks of struggle against reaction. On the whole, in a society divided into classes with opposite interests, the concepts of "the people" and the population (of the country) should neither be confused nor equated. So long as the society is being torn apart by class contradictions, the antithesis between the working masses, the people as a whole, and the ruling elite is bound to remain.

It is only in the socialist society, where the antagonism between classes has been overcome, that the country's population as a whole—workers, peasants and working intelligentsia—actually constitute the whole people.

The people and history. So, the masses are the main force of the society's progressive development, for such development is impossible without the development of the productive forces, and that, in turn, is impossible without the work of millions of people. The masses are the producers of material values, without which it is hard to imagine the normal daily life of every individual and the society as a whole. As they develop production, accumulate technical experience, and produce ever new material values (roads, factories, buildings, machines, household goods, etc.), men also perfect their instruments of labour. The development of production results in technical progress, which helps to change the productive forces and the mode of production as a whole. Such is the basic material prerequisite for the involvement of the masses in the society's advance along the road of technical and social progress.

But the people's involvement in history is not confined to that. Any political, social or national liberation movement is mainly actuated by the popular masses, without which these movements could hardly have exerted a decisive influence on the course of history. The masses' struggle against their oppressors, against rightlessness and indignity in any epoch of human history—*the class struggle*—has always been the main driving force of social revolutions aimed at a resolution of maturing contradictions, the contradictions between those who work and those who appropriate the results of that work. Slave revolts, action by the peasants and the lower urban strata under feudalism, and

the struggle of the proletarian masses under capitalism undermined the foundations of the social system in each of these epochs, being the major force which overturned these foundations and accelerated the replacement of one formation by another, more progressive one.

There are many theories which try to interpret the masses' involvement in social transformations as a purely negative phenomenon. The ideologues of the aristocracy and authoritarianism regard the masses solely as a guided, passive force of historical transformations, often presenting it as a destructive force, but never as a constructive one. According to aristocratic theories, the only constructive force is the elite, a "select" minority as the vehicle of the "spiritual" element in history. Authoritarianism and similar right-wing bourgeois trends still maintain that the masses, the "nation" is nothing without a leader (meaning a dictator), that the leader alone "charges" the people with the energy of historical action, and that it is only through such an impulse that the people realise and take up their historical mission. Demagogic slogans of that kind are being used as a cover for movements with neo-Nazi leanings, just as they were used in the past by anti-popular fascist regimes in Europe.

Such theories are refuted by history itself. The 20th century has on many occasions exposed the faulty practice of reducing the working masses to a blind, thoroughly brainwashed and obedient instrument in the hands of the reactionary elite of the imperialist states, which unleash world wars for the sake of their maniacal interests, wars which take the lives of tens of millions of people, destroy culture and jeopardise the whole human civilisation. In Nazi Germany and other fascist states, the tactics of reducing the masses to carrying out the criminal designs directed against mankind was part of state policy. But the people never resign themselves to the role of a passive and docile instrument in the hands of the ruling elite. However brutal the repressions, the masses always hope for liberation from the hated political regimes, expressing passive and, more often, active protest and using every means at their disposal to fight their oppressors.

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the building of socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries, the people's democratic revolutions in many countries of the world, and progressive transformations in the developing states of Euro-

pe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, animated by the whole working people, are a vivid example of the masses' vigorous, creative and conscious involvement in the historic transformations of our epoch.

The development of each original national culture is also the result of the people's efforts. Alongside material values, the masses also create immense spiritual values. Folklore, music, the artistic and spiritual experience gained by man in mastering the surrounding world, as reflected in works of art, in the consciousness and traditions of the people, are an inexhaustible source for many professional types of art (poetry and fiction, drama, music, ballet, painting). Many talented painters, architects, poets, writers, actors and scientists come from the midst of the people.

The practical life of the masses, of the working people is also embodied in the idiomatic wealth of the living spoken language. Language is a means of national and international intercourse. Being created by the people themselves, language records and passes on from one generation to another the society's historical and cultural experience, including its supreme spiritual achievements.

The masses also exert an essential influence on the social transformations in the society. The connection between these transformations and the changes in the mode of production, which influence the society's material and spiritual life as a whole, manifests itself through those who are directly involved in the process of material production, through the people, through the working masses. In analysing the role of the masses in periods of radical historical change, Marx and Engels came to an important conclusion: the deeper the social transformations and the larger the scale of the tasks facing the society in the period of these transformations, the more active is the part played in these by the working masses and the greater is the number of people involved in the historical events.

That major conclusion on the *growing role of the masses in the course of mankind's progressive development* lies at the root of one of the basic laws of historical materialism: *the law of historical action by the masses.* In criticising the Young Hegelians' undemocratic, elitist and subjectively idealist views of history, Marx and Engels formulated that law as follows: "Together with

the thoroughness of the historical action, the size of the mass whose action it is will therefore increase."[1]

Indeed, the acceleration of the historical process is directly connected with the activity level of the people, of the working masses. Downtrodden and oppressed by arduous subservient labour, the masses could not take an active and conscious part in the historical process under slavery or feudalism, although they were the ones whose labour created the necessary material prerequisites for social progress. Their sporadic revolts against the exploiters were invariably suppressed and so had little effect.

Historical development in these epochs was extremely slow. But when capitalism with its rapid and haphazard development of the productive forces appeared on the historical scene, ever more prerequisites began to take shape for an involvement of the broad producer masses in the processes of historical change. The rise of the industrial proletariat as an independent social class taking conscious action against the inhuman living conditions under capitalism meant the emergence of a new social force capable of exerting a crucial influence on the course of history. The acceleration of development under capitalism is primarily due to the greater involvement of the working masses in social transformations. The proletariat comes to the fore as the leading force of bourgeois-democratic, and then of socialist, anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolutions.

The involvement of the multimillion masses in politics, in the process of social transformations is an objective uniformity. The reactionary ruling circles of the imperialist states fear such an involvement most of all. The present-day bourgeoisie has been using the most diverse means to distract the masses from the tasks of fundamental social transformations.

Through a smoothly running mechanism for the ideological indoctrination of the masses, through the mass media, propaganda, literature and art, the ruling bourgeois elite seeks to implant a stereotyped perception of reality. Bourgeois propaganda creates an illusion of democracy and individual freedom. The capitalist elite manipulates the consciousness of the masses with the help of demagogic promises spread by its appointees from among a

[1] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "The Holy Family", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1975, p. 82.

hand-fed "working-class aristocracy", who pose as "popular leaders". But that practice of ideological and political brainwashing is less and less effective, for most working people are coming to realise that capitalism can never ensure real equality for all members of the society or enable all the working people to take part in running production and the affairs of state, in active and constructive labour for the benefit of the society.

All of that becomes possible only under socialism. The experience of existing socialism shows that the new society is created by the energy and skills of the working masses themselves. One of the laws of socialism is the growing activity of the working people in shaping the new social relations, which help to unite all those who work, doing what they can to promote the society's advance towards mature socialism and communism. For the first time in mankind's history, socialism enables the masses to enjoy the level of material wellbeing and culture which they attain by their own labour. Under socialism, people work for themselves, for their own society. They feel themselves to be masters of their fate, and that feeling engenders confidence in the future, optimism and an urge to work even better. Labour enthusiasm, socialist emulation and a constant creative quest for new and more perfect forms of organising labour, daily life, rest and recreation have become the crucial, decisive features of the people's life under socialism.

The political vanguard of the people—the communist party—which sets before them concrete goals and tasks in building the new society and points out the ways to attain these, helps to enhance the role of the working masses in social development in the socialist countries.

Equipped with their progressive and scientific Marxist-Leninist theory of social development, the communist parties guide the working people in their constructive activity, educate them, encourage their creative endeavour, and direct their efforts towards raising the efficiency of social production, strengthening the conscientious attitude to work, and scoring fresh labour successes for the benefit of the society as a whole. In the name and in the interests of the peoples, the communist parties follow a policy of peaceful coexistence in international affairs, seeking to reduce the danger of nuclear war and to strengthen peace throughout the world. The socialist countries' internationalist for-

eign policy expresses the peaceful aspirations of all the peoples of our planet, big and small. In order to ensure its peaceful future, the peoples of diverse countries have been coming out against the imperialist policy of nuclear insanity.

The individual in history. The growing role of the masses in the cardinal political and social transformations of the epoch accentuates the question about the importance of the leadership of mass revolutionary movements, that is, about the role of individuals in history, about the individual's relation to the processes connected with the development and reconstruction of the society.

Historical epochs change and the society advances in accordance with definite laws connected with the development of material social production, the relations within the society's economic basis and its superstructure. These relations exist objectively and independently of the consciousness and activity of individuals. Does that mean that the individual cannot influence these relations, that he has nothing to do with social development, with the historical process? Not at all. Marxism rejects such a view of the matter. In regarding historical events as the result of definite objective causes, which determine the course of these events, Marxist social theory does not in the least underrate the importance of individuals taking a direct part in these events, which constitute the living fabric of human history.

History is made by people, by the masses, and the masses are a unity of concrete individuals. So, if one recognises the active role of the masses in the historical process, one should not underestimate the contribution made to that process by each individual, both outstanding personalities (military and other leaders, statesmen, politicians, etc., who exert a guiding and directing influence on that process) and its immediate, rank-and-file participants, its agents, whose specific actions determine the course of that process.

Let us recall the recent past.

During the Second World War, tens of millions of people took part in the struggle against fascism. The striving for world domination on the part of a relatively small oligarchic elite in the fascist states, fostered by Western imperialist circles, was thwarted by the joint efforts of the peoples, primarily by the heroic struggle of the Soviet people. Bearing the brunt of the aggressor's at-

tack, suffering irretrievable human losses (over 20 million) and immense material damage (as a result of hostilities on the European territory of the USSR, many towns, cities, villages, plants, factories, roads, communication lines, cultural and historical monuments, etc., were either totally destroyed or were left in ruins), the Soviet people, each Soviet citizen mustered all their strength and resources for the struggle against fascism. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the vanguard of the people's struggle against fascism both on the battle-field and on the home front. It directed the activities of tens of millions of Soviet people: front-line fighters, heroic partisans, and selfless workers in the rear. Under the Party's guidance, the Soviet people dealt the decisive and crushing blow at German fascism and Japanese militarism. The Soviet Union won the Great Patriotic War as a result of the Soviet people's feat of arms and heroic labour, and owing to the military genius of the commanders of the Soviet Army, which was able to crush the powerful war machine of Nazi Germany.

The plans of the fascist oligarchy to reverse the tide of history were doomed to failure primarily owing to the actions of individual human beings, of everyone who fought and often lost one's life in the fierce battles against fascism, who worked hard on the home front to bring about a victory, who organised, guided and directed these efforts, and who fought against fascism on the "invisible" front in the enemy rear.

There are many other vivid examples showing how mass historical action is made up of the efforts of individuals, groups, parties and classes. Mankind's entire history is made up of such joint actions. In speaking of the Marxist approach to an assessment of the individual's role in history, Lenin noted that what distinguishes that approach from all the other socialist theories is that it "combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations, and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class".[1]

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Against Boycott", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, 1978, p. 36.

Marxist social theory does not deny the importance of the contribution made by historical personalities to the actions of the masses. On the contrary, it offers a consistently scientific explanation of the objective and subjective prerequisites for involving the individual in the socio-historical process, of the importance of each individual's contribution to the attainment of socially meaningful goals, and the causes of the success or failure of that contribution.

Lenin wrote: "The real question that arises in appraising the social activity of an individual is: what conditions ensure the success of his actions, what guarantee is there that these actions will not remain an isolated act lost in a welter of contrary acts?"[1] Consequently, the point is how the individual's actions correlate with the conditions of social development, with the interests, tasks and goals of the social groups, strata and classes which are the motive forces of social reconstruction in a given historical period.

Marxist social theory starts from the objective dialectics of singular (particular), specific and general causes operating in the society's life and its history. Thus, the *general* cause of history is the development of the productive forces, its *specific* causes are the historical conditions in which that development takes place, and its *singular,* accidental causes are the personal traits of public figures, which often put a special, individual tint on particular historical events.

In emphasising and elaborating that idea, Georgi Plekhanov wrote: "*Singular* causes cannot bring about radical changes in the operation of *general* and *specific* causes, which, moreover, determine the direction and the bounds of the influence exerted by particular causes. Yet there is no doubt that history would have had a different complexion had the particular causes which influenced it yielded place to other causes of the same order."[2] So, if the success of an individual's social activity depends on the conditions in which that activity takes place, what are the conditions that guarantee its success? Plek-

[1] V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works,* Vol. 1, p. 159.

[2] Georgi Plekhanov, "On the Question of the Individual's Role in History", *Selected Philosophical Works* in five volumes, Vol. II, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 314.

hanov explains: "Two conditions must be met for a man with a special talent to thereby acquire great influence on the course of events. First, this talent must make him better suited to the social needs of a definite epoch than anyone else... Second, the existing social order must not bar the road to a person possessing a talent necessary and useful at this particular time."[1]

So what are the guarantees that an individual's activity can really influence the course of historical development? Plekhanov specifies: "...If I know in what way social relations are changing because of changes in the socio-economic process of production, I also know the direction social mentality is moving towards: consequently, I am able to influence it. Influencing social mentality means influencing historical events. Hence, in a certain sense, I *can* yet *make history,* and there is no need for me to wait until '*it is made*'."[2]

Recognising the role of outstanding personalities in history, Marxist social theory regards them as the products of definite social needs and conditions. What is an outstanding personality? In the Marxist view, it is an individual who is capable of bold and profound thought and who can understand the new social requirements, supporting and developing progressive views and ideals, and tying these in with the basic vital interests of the working masses. As a product of definite social relations, of the epoch and social development, the individual can influence the historical process, though not by himself, but only in connection with the activity of a definite class or party, with the direct involvement of the people.

The historical merits of individuals depend on *how much* they *have done for their people* and to advance the general course of progress.

There is yet another aspect of the individual's activity in history, which should not be underestimated either. Depending on a number of objective and subjective factors (abilities, etc.), an individual who understands the tasks facing the society can either accelerate the course of events or slow it down, either facilitate the solution of urgent problems or hinder it. In other words,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 309.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

depending on the actual historical conditions, and also on the character of the individual's activity, he or she can exert either a progressive or a reactionary influence on social development. But whatever an individual's talent for influencing the course of events, no one can change their overall direction or reverse history. The whole course of events in history takes shape in accordance with objective laws which are independent of individual will or consciousness.

The more majestic the task facing this or that class and the more progressive the class itself, the greater is the historical importance of the activities of individuals produced by that class. "Not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its prominent representatives able to organise a movement and lead it."[1] The working class produced its great leaders: Marx, Engels and Lenin. These men of genius were outstanding theorists and ardent fighters who organised the revolutionary movement.

In the transition from capitalism to communism, the masses are led and organised by the communist parties, which are strong because they express the interests of the working class, of the broad masses. Over nearly a century and a half, the communist and working-class movement in different countries has accumulated an immense store of experience in the mutual relations between leaders, parties and the masses. Reflecting the needs of the working class, of the broad masses and the epoch as a whole, the communist parties and their leaders project (or, in the socialist countries, point out to the masses in practice) the only true way towards a revolutionary reconstruction of the capitalist society, the way of peace, social progress and socialism.

So, it is the people themselves, i.e., the masses and individuals, who are the real motive force of history.

In explaining the correlation between the collective historical action of the masses and that of individuals, one should neither underestimate the importance of the former, nor overestimate the contribution of the latter.

The influence of individuals on history, on the actions of the masses—the main motive force of history—depends on the ex-

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 370.

tent to which these individuals take part in the historical transformations of the epoch.

Since the masses tend to play an ever greater role in modern history, the importance of each individual as its participant grows accordingly.

The more significant are the tasks facing the society, the greater is the importance of the question about progressive social forces, classes and individuals directing the activities of the masses in the course of social transformations.

6. HISTORICAL FORMS OF COMMUNITY

Any analysis of the main prerequisites of the human society and its history would be incomplete without an examination of the historically developing forms of joint human life: the main *historical forms of community.* Such an examination will help to understand how a definite social system influences the ethnic and national relations existing in the given society, to understand their functional specifics and development uniformities. The main historical forms of community include the *gens, tribe, nationality* and *nation.*

Emerging and developing in the mainstream of social progress, the historical forms of human community replace one another with changes in the society's economic basis. In *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State,* Engels showed very well that the replacement of one form of community by another is a law-governed and historically necessary process, stemming from the development of the mode of production of material values. Together with a definite mode of production, basis and superstructural relations, each historical form of community is therefore an integral component of this or that socio-economic formation.

Gens. The first historical form of community was the gens, where people were connected with each other by ties of blood and economic relations. It was preceded by the primitive herd (a transitional form of community), which existed for hundreds of thousands of years while man himself was being formed and was acquiring labour skills. The gentile community (commune) was still based on joint, collective ownership and use of the means of production.

Having replaced the primitive herd, the gens asserted the relations between people as members of the primary production, social and ethnic collective of the classless society. All the members of the commune had common origins, language, daily life, customs, beliefs and culture.

Tribe. With the development of economic activity, the gentile form of social organisation eventually evolved into a tribal form. The tribe was the result of an association of two or more communes, each of which remained an independent production and social unit within the tribe. The primitive-communal mode of production was the definitive basis of that society. The land, dwellings, tools and household utensils of the commune's members were held as common property. As the tribal organisation became more complicated, it gave rise to such administrative institutions as elders, military chiefs, high priests, the tribal council, etc.

The tribal form of community created favourable conditions for the development of human economic activity, production experience, language and culture. But the relations of kinship which lay at the root of the gens and the tribe were a major obstacle to the development of intertribal contacts, slowing down the development of economic relations between separate tribes.

All the peoples of the world passed through that initial stage of development. The emergence of cattle-breeding and the switch to ploughing in agriculture helped to increase agricultural output. Wealth began to accumulate within the framework of the commune and individual families. The highest stage in the development of the tribal system saw the emergence and evolution first of familial and then of private property in tools and other means of production. And that eventually led to changes in that system, to an erosion of the primitive-communal society and a transition to a class society.

Nationality. The formation of the class society entailed profound changes in human life. The development of social division of labour and exchange relations engendered a form of community based not only on kinship, but also on definite territorial ties between people. The ever more complicated economic and trade relations accelerated the emergence of a qualitatively new form of human community: the nationality.

The nationality takes shape as a community of people living

on one and the same territory and connected by one and the same language (with a retention of the dialects of the constituent tribes), and one and the same way of life, cemented by common traditions, rights and customs which regulate relations between its members.

That form of community is determined by the economic structure of precapitalist class relations of production. Economic ties at that stage are still marked by a certain seclusion and are mostly of local importance, and different areas are still isolated in their economic and daily life. These peculiarities, engendered by the unevennes of economic and social development, are still evident in the life of some ethnic groups in our day, which is reflected in their differing economic, everyday and historico-cultural structures.

Nation. With the development of the capitalist mode of production, prerequisites are created for a strengthening and all-round expansion of economic and other ties between separate nationalities, which helps to turn them into nations.

Nations are formed on the basis of a steady community of economic life which is characteristic of the capitalist formation. "Nations," Lenin wrote, "are an inevitable product, an inevitable form, in the bourgeois epoch of social development."[1] Capitalist commodity relations put an end to the economic disunity of separate economic regions, help to strengthen ties between the people of a given nationality and those of neighbouring nationalities, and help to form a language that is common to them all, a common culture, and a common national mentality. So, a nation emerges as a *stable community of people connected by common territory and economic life, a common language and common traits of national character.* This community is also manifested in a specific culture.

The formation of nations and their consolidation under capitalism is also promoted by the emergence of a centralised state, which regulates and embodies definite social relations in legal acts.

Capitalism and national relations. Under capitalism, national relations are consolidated. Their formation and development go through several consecutive stages.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Karl Marx", *Collected Works,* Vol. 21, p. 72.

The first of these was connected with the rise of capitalism and the disintegration of feudalism. In that period, nationalities developed into nations. It was a period of revolutions and national liberation wars, when the bourgeoisie launched a struggle against feudalism, advancing the idea of national unity.

At the second stage, when capitalism spread across the world, developed into a world system and reached its highest, imperialist stage, the most economically and technically advanced bourgeois nations (Britain, France, the USA and others) established their colonial rule over the rest of the world. The imperialist states divided the world into spheres of economic and political influence. As they subjugated and plundered other peoples, each of these states became a vehicle of colonial oppression.

The late 19th and early 20th centuries saw a powerful upsurge in the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples. That process was particularly accelerated by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917, which ushered in the third stage, marked by the collapse of the world colonial system and the formation of independent nations in the countries that had chosen the road of struggle against imperialist domination. After the Second World War, the peoples' liberation process was given powerful support by the world socialist system. In the present epoch, the process of the formation of new nations has embraced virtually the whole of mankind, going hand in hand with radical social transformations in the advance from capitalism to socialism.

As capitalism evolved into imperialism, national relations were marked by an ever greater polarisation of two interrelated tendencies: first, ruthless exploitation of the working people by the ruling class of bourgeois states and the latter's more intensive economic, political, national and other oppression of the colonial and dependent peoples; and second, a growth of national liberation movements both in the countries dependent on imperialism and in the metropolitan countries themselves.

The struggle between these two tendencies is also due to the development of capitalism itself, which involves an ever greater internationalisation of its economic and social life. That struggle is reflected in a clash between *nationalism* and *internationalism,* the two main lines in resolving the national question under capitalism. The struggle between these two lines is a struggle be-

tween the two classes of the capitalist world. The first of these—the bourgeoisie—advocates nationalism, while the second—the working class—champions proletarian internationalism in the interests of all the working people.

The struggle between bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism is also specifically reflected in the contest between diverse chauvinistic and racist doctrines, which variously seek to substantiate the superiority of some nations over others, on the one hand, and the progressive goals of anti-colonial, democratic and national liberation movements, on the other. In most countries, the working masses are the backbone of such movements, although the local bourgeoisie is often involved as well; by entering into a temporary alliance with the popular masses and supporting progressive slogans, it seeks to use them to strengthen its own positions.

The working class and its vanguard, the proletarian party, are the truly consistent champions of the masses' interests in these movements. Asserting the principle of proletarian internationalism in the minds of the working people, the party is in the van of the struggle for a full and final liberation of the working people from any forms of inequality and national oppression.

Proletarian internationalism is antithetical both to any forms of bourgeois nationalism, whose theorists proclaim a "community" of the national interests of the working people and the bourgeoisie, and to cosmopolitanism, the ideology of the imperialist circles. Proletarian internationalism alone upholds the vital interests of all the working people, tying these in with the goals of the national movement for social progress. From the standpoint of the common interests of all the working people—the standpoint of proletarian internationalism—the working class and its political vanguard, the party, carry on a vigorous struggle to overcome the inequality and the domination of some nations by others, regarding that as the fairest answer to the national question.

The national question under capitalism. The national question, that is, *the question about the ways and means of eliminating any forms of national oppression and asserting equitable relations between nations and peoples*, acquires exceptional importance under capitalism, becoming a key question of social development.

With the formation of national states in the initial period of

capitalist development, when the assertion of a new and more progressive (as compared with earlier formations) social system entailed an overall consolidation of national life, which exerted a strong influence on the development of the economy, ideology and politics, that question was largely connected with the continued inequality of national minorities within some multinational states. Among such states in Europe, for instance, were Austria-Hungary and the Russian empire, where national oppression of certain national minorities was coupled with their economic, political and cultural oppression, so that the question of struggle for their liberation from any of the existing forms of inequality was a particularly imperative one. It was also relevant to other countries in Europe, Asia and America.

The national question took on a particular urgency towards the beginning of the 20th century. As capitalism evolved into its highest, imperialist stage, national inequality acquired new forms and a new content. The world was divided into predominant, economically and otherwise advanced nations, and peoples that depended on them. Hence the world colonial system of imperialism. Its backbone was made up of Britain, France, Spain, Portugal and other countries which in the past had conquered numerous colonies and still retained economic and political domination over them. True, by the beginning of the 20th century Spain had virtually lost its influence over its once-largest Latin American empire, but the vacuum in that region was soon filled by the USA. US neocolonialism continued to spread to other continents as well. The struggle between the imperialist states for spheres of colonial influence further aggravated the economic, political and other contradictions of world capitalism, which led both to global and to numerous "minor" wars, and engendered new forms of colonial and semi-colonial dependence of Asian, African and Latin American peoples.

So, the dimensions of the national question were markedly enlarged with the development of capitalism itself. It was no longer an internal matter of individual bourgeois states, but a question of international importance, of world social development.

The division of nations into oppressed and oppressing further aggravated the contradictions in the development of national relations intrinsic to capitalism. In setting up gigantic international companies (banks, trusts, corporations, etc.), uniting the world

economy, and internationalising economic, financial, political, cultural and scientific ties between states, imperialism continues to use coercion in order to establish its rule and keeps looking for ever new, more effective and ingenious forms of oppressing and plundering dependent countries and peoples.

It is no longer individual peoples, but whole groups of countries united by their geographical and economic position that fall victim to the neocolonialism of the US-led imperialist states. The USA, Britain and other states make no secret of the fact that their policy in this or that region of the world is geared to defend their "strategic" interests. That implies not only defence of the economic interests of the monopolies and transnational corporations, but largely also a suppression of any progressive national liberation movements at their inception.

In recent years, the crisis of national relations in most capitalist states has taken a particularly sharp turn. The discrimination against the smaller nationalities and the virtually legalised inequality of ethnic minorities infringe on the vital rights of large numbers of people. In Britain, many immigrants from the Commonwealth countries, who had to leave their homeland in search of jobs, are victims of open discrimination in the matters of employment, remuneration, housing, etc.; in the West European countries, foreign workers coming from Southern Europe or Africa are often discriminated against; and in the USA, the condition of Blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans is a dire indication of national inequality, rightlessness and oppression. National relations under capitalism are shot through with innumerable contradictions.

Socialism and the national question. Marx and Engels proclaimed in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: "In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."[1]

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917 opened a new epoch in national relations, and not only among the peoples of Russia itself, but also among many other countries of the world. From the very outset, the Soviet state proclaimed the full equality and sovereignty of all the peoples of Russia. That was reflected in the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of

[1] Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 503.

Russia, adopted on November 15, 1917. By proclaiming the sovereignty of the peoples of Russia, the Soviet state recognised the right of each of them to independent development and eliminated the various national privileges and restrictions.

The voluntary unification of the peoples of Russia led to the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in December 1922 as the first multinational state in mankind's history based on true equality of the rights of its constituent peoples, irrespective of their development level. In order to make that equality truly effectual, the Soviet state projected and launched a broad programme of economic, social and cultural development in the former national outskirts of tsarist Russia. The transformations in the social structure and the formation of new social relations were thus parallelled by an assertion of a new type of national relations: relations of equality, mutual respect and cooperation among the most diverse, big and small, nationalities. That also helped to strengthen the monolithic and unbreakable unity of the Soviet peoples.

In a historically short period, the vestiges of the peoples' economic and cultural backwardness were totally eliminated. Each of them now had an opportunity freely to develop its national culture, with access to the cultural achievements of the other Soviet peoples. Socialism gave a new lease of life to many small nationalities doomed to gradual extinction under tsarism. As they developed their economy, culture and language (before the revolution, some of the smaller nationalities had no written language of their own and acquired one only after the revolution) these nationalities rapidly assimilated the achievements of the bigger nations.

An internationalisation of the society's economic, social and spiritual life under socialism also helps to bring the nations and nationalities closer together, creating conditions for broader contacts between them. As a result of the successes scored by socialism and the formation of a new type of national relations, a new historical type of social and international community—the *Soviet people*—took shape in the USSR.

Under mature socialism, the *law of an organic unity of the national and the international* operates in every sphere of social life, including the relations between nations and nationalities. Socialism ensures a unity of the specific interests of each nation with

the interests of the country's multinational population. That law also manifests itself in the relations between states of the socialist community. The new-type international relations existing between the socialist countries are marked by a harmonisation of the interests of each country's economic, political and cultural development with those of the community as a whole. That is evident from the tendencies towards an economic integration of the socialist countries on a truly equitable and just basis, from the coordination of their national economic plans, the deepening division of labour, the mutual exchange of scientific and technical achievements, specialisation and cooperation in such vitally important spheres as the strengthening of their defence capability and the drive for peace, and also coordination of their assistance to other, primarily developing, countries.

Socialism sets a convincing example of how the interests of individual countries and peoples can be truly harmonised, without ruling out the specifics and diversity of their historical experience. Any attempts by imperialist ideologues to present the variety of the ways and methods of asserting the socialist way of life as a manifestation of nationalism, a divergence of the goals and programmes of socialist construction in different countries are invalid, for these attempts reflect a patently false and distorted idea about the nature of national relations under socialism, a social system which puts an end to any form of social and national inequality.

Socialism, a future-oriented system, creates conditions for bringing diverse nations and nationalities closer together, and forms common features in the character of the people, for whom the experience of their own national culture and the material and spiritual achievement of other peoples merge into a single whole.

* * *

In summing up this chapter, one should note that:

— the Marxist approach to studying the prerequisites of the society and the motive forces of its history brings out the objective dialectics of the natural and social conditions of human production activity and various aspects of social being and consciousness;

—Marxist social theory gives a consistently scientific explanation of various aspects of life in the society as an integral social organism, of the laws of its functioning and development;

—the materialist explanation of the historical process shows the specifics of its basic uniformities and offers scientific guidelines for studying the tendencies of that process in mankind's past, present and future.

Chapter Four

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

As it was shown in Chapter Three, social development is a succession of socio-economic formations, a process which unfolds in accordance with the laws of the development of the modes of material production intrinsic to each formation. These laws also result in a lack of social uniformity, in the society's division into large groups of people known as classes. In examining the motive forces of history and the historical role of the popular masses and individuals, we have already touched upon various aspects of socio-class relations. Marxism regards these relations as the initial and basic components of the society's social structure.

1. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE: THE CONCEPT DEFINED

Marx was the first to use the concept of structure in social science for an analysis of the human society. He examined the society's structure on the strength of its material production prerequisites. His view of the society as a system of variously interconnected relations enabled Marx to present these relations as an integral social structure.

Social structure is an integral concept characterising diverse aspects of social life and bringing out the interconnection between definite social relations (economic, legal, political, moral, religious, etc.) and their mutual arrangement. These relations constitute relatively autonomous systems and subsystems within the framework of the social structure as a whole, being its initial components.

The subjects, the vehicles of all these relations are people, concrete individuals. As social agents, they create and transform these relations, and so also the social structure as a whole. Marx-

ism rejects any abstract, non-historical interpretations of the social structure, in which "man" is contrasted with the "society", maintaining that such a contrast is unjustified. Marxism starts from the premise that man is a social being, that he is both a product and an architect of the society in which he lives.

As an individual, that is, as a social being, man is connected with the surrounding world by diverse relations. These relations in their totality form the social structure of the society. The complicated, multilevel nature of these relations calls for an approach that would make it possible to determine the crucial, causative relations and those which are derivative and dependent on the former.

In analysing the process of material, economic life in the society, Marx found that such causative relations were primarily the relations between classes.

In a society divided into large groups of people, each of which has its own special place in the social structure in view of the existing division of labour, its economic status, its place in the system of production, etc., the relations between classes permeate every sphere of life and determine all the other social relations.

The society's social structure should therefore be studied primarily in the light of the relations taking shape between classes. The social structure is made up of the classes, groups and strata that exist in a given society and the system of their mutual relations.

Bourgeois theories of the social structure take a non-class (or supra-class) approach to the content of its constituent relations, reducing these to distinctions in the "subcultures", "ideologies" and ways of life of separate groups (ethnic communities, generations, etc.) and trying to pinpoint among these distinctions their different value orientations in the light of which people see their place in the social structure.

But the individual's place in the social structure is not determined by his subjective notions, but by the real, objective socio-economic distinctions connected with his place within the system of material production relations that exist in the society. Social differentiation stems from the relations that take shape between people in the process of production and distribution of labour products in each particular society. It cannot be reduced to distinctions in age, sex, generation or nationality although the lat-

ter can acquire a qualitative social significance in the context of a definite socio-class structure. However, they cannot be seen as the initial categories of social differentiation. There is no ground for asserting (as the theorists of "youth protest", women's and other movements in the West often do) that the socially meaningful distinctions existing in the society between separate groups, strata, substrata, etc., imply the existence of corresponding "classes", which take shape through a similar perception of life, of reality. The social distinctions between various groups (women, the young, the aged, etc.) are objectively determined primarily by the place of each of these groups in the social structure of the society, by the fact that they belong to a particular class.

In examining history as a succession of socio-economic formations, we have already drawn a conclusion on the law-governed succession of producer-classes, on the one hand, and the classes that own the means of production, on the other, with the emergence, development and decline of the corresponding modes of production in each antagonistic type of society: slaveholding, feudal and capitalist. It is precisely in a society based on private property in the means of production, economic inequality and man's exploitation of man that classes first emerged. The antithesis between the economic status of classes and their interests led to an intensive and constant struggle between them. For thousands of years, mankind's history was marked by ceaseless struggle, because class struggle is the motive force in the development of antagonistic socio-economic formations.

Before turning to the prerequisites of changes in the social structure, let us consider the scientific definition of the concept of "class", the origins and essence of classes.

2. CLASSES AND THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Pre-Marxist political economy, philosophy and sociology also recognised the society's division into classes. Their understanding of class distinctions, however, was largely confined to an idealistic view of the society. The social thought of the past could not bring out the objective basis of class divisions, which lies in the sphere of material social production. That was done by Marx and Engels, who discovered that the society's division into classes is primarily due to economic causes, and that the source of social

inequality lies in the social division of labour, connected with economic inequality, with the society's division into rich and poor. Engels wrote that "*all* past history... was the history of class struggles; that these warring classes of society are always the products of the modes of production and of exchange—in a word, of the *economic* conditions of their time".[1]

So, each mode of production creates its own socio-class structure. Each antagonistic mode of production engenders its own peculiar division of the society into classes: under the slaveholding mode of production, the society was divided into slave-owners and slaves; under feudalism, into landowners (feudal lords) and peasants; and under capitalism, into capitalists and proletarians (the working class). That is why any class should be seen in the context of the definite mode of production that produced that class.

Lenin gave a profound and all-round definition of classes in a work entitled "A Great Beginning". He wrote: "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."[2]

The division into classes affects the entire system of social relations in any antagonistic formation. That is reflected both in the economic organisation of the class society and in its ideological, political and cultural life. Irreconcilable class contradictions engender the class struggle, which pervades the whole social structure. Many of the distinctions that characterise the social structure (like those between workers by hand and by brain, between urban and rural dwellers, or between ethnic, age, occupational and other groups) are exacerbated in a society divided into antagonistic classes.

Present-day Western sociologists increasingly urge the need to

[1] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 35.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 421.

examine diverse cross-sections of the social structure from the angle of class and intra-class distinctions. The theories of so-called social stratification (i.e., the singling out of independent social strata on the strength of everyday, ethnic or occupational culture, educational level, etc.) do not bring out such distinctions, for they underestimate in varying degree the objective, socio-economic criteria of the division into classes.

Marxism, on the contrary, examines the distinctions in the social status of various groups, strata and substrata within a given class[1] in the general context of the society's social structure, connecting these distinctions with the development and change of definite modes of production. The classes engendered by the mode of production that prevails in a given society are its *basic classes*. In addition to these, the society often has what are known as *transitional classes,* whose existence is either due to a retention of some elements of earlier modes of production or to the emergence of new economic structures. Within the social structure, these classes are *non-basic*. Under slavery, for instance, such non-basic classes were the landed peasants and handicraftsmen. As for capitalism, its non-basic classes include the big landowners (who use both archaic and modern, capitalist modes of exploiting the farmers, the petty bourgeoisie (small traders, house-owners, craftsmen, etc.).

So, changes in the society's social structure are connected with changes in the correlation between classes (basic and non-basic) conditioned by the development of a definite mode of production. In many developing countries, the specifics of the changes going forward within the social structure are usually predetermined by the multistructural nature of the economy. The correlation of classes within the social structure of these countries can only be understood through an analysis of its old, traditional, and its new components (including those connected with industrialisation—with the emergence and growth of the national working class, the formation of an intelligentsia stratum, etc.).

[1] Within the bourgeoisie, for instance, one can single out diverse groupings of the monopoly bourgeoisie, big industrial and banking capital, the middle bourgeoisie (both urban and rural), and diverse petty-bourgeois strata (often semi-proletarised), whose status objectively brings them close to the mass of working people (the industrial and agricultural proletariat), but which retain their small-proprietor, individualistic mentality.

The status, size and correlation of various classes and strata within the social structure change in direct connection with the development of production. Thus, the share of the bourgeoisie in the social structure of the present-day capitalist society has been steadily declining. The concentration of capital and the scientific and technical revolution have entailed considerable changes in the capitalist mode of production. A special stratum—the monopoly bourgeoisie—has stood out from the capitalist class. The number of small and middle proprietors has gone down sharply as the monopolies have taken over the property of uncompetitive private entrepreneurs. As a result, the monopoly bourgeoisie in the developed capitalist countries now constitutes from 1 to 4 per cent of the gainfully employed population. The power and wealth of the monopoly stratum, however, have continued to grow. The greater centralisation of capital has intensified the struggle between various groupings within the capitalist class. The latter has also come to confront a larger army of wage-workers, which has swelled at the expense of the ruined petty and middle bourgeoisie, both urban and rural.

The development of capitalism has involved a proletarisation of the petty bourgeoisie, which is being ruined and either falls into economic dependence on big capital or loses its property in the means of production altogether. That is an objective and law-governed process, reflecting Marx's law of the growing concentration of capital. While serving to ruin small producers who cannot stand the economic competition, that process does not entail their total expulsion from the capitalist class. The monopolies often find it more profitable to control the activity of small enterprises rather than assume their production functions. That is why in the conditions of tough and ceaseless competition the ruin and proletarisation of a section of small and middle producers in some branches of the economy goes hand in hand with a reproduction of such producers in others. And that process is characteristic of present-day monopoly capitalism.

Another crucial feature of the changes in the socio-class structure of the capitalist society is the growing size and share of the army of wage-workers. At the beginning of the 1980s, it came to over 80 per cent of the gainfully employed population in the developed capitalist countries.

To trace the dynamics of the growth of the working class un-

der capitalism in its historical perspective, one could compare two figures: at the end of the 19th century, the number of industrial workers in the biggest Western countries totalled roughly 30 million, and by the mid-20th century it had almost doubled to more than 58 million. In our day, the working class has been growing on a global scale, as the process has also spread to numerous developing countries, which have a burgeoning working class of their own. Qualitative changes are also under way in the structure of the working class itself, resulting from the development of production under the STR (rising skill standards among the workers, greater specialisation, etc.).

The social status of the working class and the qualitative changes in its complexion in effect refute the theories according to which the social structure of present-day capitalism has been developing towards an accelerating growth of the so-called "new middle classes", which include both mental and manual workers (the intelligentsia, office personnel, managerial staff, etc.). The task of such theories is to "smooth over" socio-class distinctions under capitalism.

In actual fact, however, the basic distinctions in the social status of the working class, the farmers, various strata of the intelligentsia, office personnel, etc., are not "smoothed over" but remain under present-day capitalism. Even if any levelling does occur, it is only towards an ever greater proletarisation of the most diverse groups and strata of the capitalist society. That creates both objective and subjective prerequisites for a closer alliance between the working class and broad working strata in town and country, helping to consolidate all the anti-monopoly forces led by the working class.

An analysis of the social structure of the present-day capitalist society calls, therefore, for a qualitative approach based on a study of the correlation of classes and strata within the capitalist mode of production, from which that structure arises and under whose influence it develops. Thus, an increase in the number of office personnel (or white-collar workers, as they are known in applied sociology) and the intelligentsia does not in itself signify any profound qualitative changes in the social structure of capitalism, for in their socio-economic status these groups are drawing closer to the working class. Naturally, both the intelligentsia (especially members of the so-called liberal profes-

sions—lawyers, doctors, workers in culture and the arts) and employees (top managerial stratum) have an elite of their own, which has coalesced with the ruling class and which serves its interests, and also fairly numerous groups standing at much lower rungs of the social ladder. Stratification of the capitalist society embraces all groups and classes without exception. So, far from being erased, socio-class distinctions under capitalism are further deepened as the main, pivotal tendency in the development of its social structure. That development is marked by an antithesis and polarisation of the interests of its basic classes—the bourgeoisie and the oligarchy, on the one hand, and the working class, all the working masses, on the other—and by ever more intensive class battles.

The class struggle runs through the whole of mankind's history and is a powerful instrument of radical social transformations. Under present-day capitalism, as in any earlier antagonistic society, the class struggle unfolds in every sphere of life without exception: the economy, politics, ideology and culture.

That struggle manifests itself in a clash between the fundamental, essential interests of the toiling classes and those who exploit them, who hold the levers of economic, political and ideological domination in the society. That is why the struggle of the toiling classes for their rights takes the forms of *economic, political and ideological struggle*. In the economic struggle, the main emphasis is on improving the working people's material-economic condition. The political and ideological struggle develops on a higher plane, as the masses come to understand their place, their historical role and tasks in the struggle for economic, political and social emancipation from capitalist oppression.

All these forms of class struggle are closely interconnected. The working people's struggle for an improvement of their material condition (economic struggle), against the political domination of the bourgeoisie, for working people's power, and for a democratisation of the society (political struggle), against spiritual oppression, for a progressive ideology (ideological struggle) influences the social structure of any society divided into antagonistic classes. The class struggle paves the way for progressive transformations through a radical change in every sphere of so-

cial life. Such a change amounts to a *social revolution,* whose highest form is a socialist revolution.

A socialist revolution brings about radical transformations in the social structure of the capitalist society. It puts an end to private property in the means of production, and so also to the exploiter classes as a whole, to the antagonism between labour and capital, and asserts true social equality for all members of the society, irrespective of nationality, skin colour, religious and other views and convictions.

3. SOCIALISM: TOWARDS A NEW TYPE OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE

With the victory of a socialist revolution, a new type of social structure begins to take shape and is steadily perfected on the basis of deep-going and all-round transformations of the capitalist system. The social structure under socialism comprises two basic friendly classes: the working class and the collective farmers, and also the working intelligentsia, a growing social stratum which consists of diverse groups and substrata (scientific and technical, military, artistic intelligentsia, etc.). These groups and substrata have no independent status in the system of social production, and do not constitute an independent class.

The socio-class structure of the socialist society takes shape (as it was in the USSR) as a result of fundamental changes in the class composition of the country's population. These changes reflect the basic uniformities of the transformations that take place in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and in laying the foundations of socialism.

The triumphant socialist revolution in Russia in 1917 entailed the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. That form of state power in the transition period enabled the working people to uphold their gains in the struggle against the attempts of the overthrown propertied classes to restore their lost privileges not only by way of an open intervention launched by imperialism against the Soviet Republic, but also by way of destabilising the economy from within, by way of political boycott and isolation, and also sabotage by bourgeois-minded specialists, intellectuals and officials.

In the transition period, the proletarian dictatorship did not put an end to the struggle between classes. Having strengthened

the political power of the victorious working class, the proletarian dictatorship in Russia continued to perform its coercive tasks in the class struggle of the transition period (suppression of the remnants of the exploiter classes, civil war), but was now also able to tackle purely constructive tasks in order to neutralise the influence of the petty bourgeoisie, enlist the cooperation of bourgeois specialists, help the peasantry and the intelligentsia to break the spell of bourgeois ideology, and draw them into the work being done to root out the social aftermath of capitalism and lay the foundations of socialism.

Within two decades of the revolution, the basis of a new type of social structure, consisting of working classes and strata, had taken shape in the USSR. Over these years, all remnants of the exploiter classes had been overcome and gradually disappeared. As existing socialism continued to grow stronger, the social structure developed (and continues to develop) towards an erasure of socio-class distinctions between different groups of the population. As these distinctions are being overcome in the developed socialist society, a homogeneous social structure is gradually taking shape. This is a law-governed, though protracted process, connected with the advance of mature socialism towards a classless social structure.

The experience of transformations in the social structure of different socialist countries is diverse and abundant, and in view of its diversity that experience is of great practical interest. After all, the revolutionary reconstruction of the society affects the future of millions upon millions of people. It cannot follow routine patterns. The ways of social reconstruction are in each particular case determined by the concrete historical conditions. In most socialist countries after the Second World War these transformations took a somewhat different road than they did in Russia after the October Revolution.

As the exploiter classes disappear in the course of socialist construction, the alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the people's intelligentsia tends to strengthen. The leading role here belongs to the working class, which remains the society's main productive force, and which initiates and organises all the progressive undertakings in the quest for ways to optimise production and perfect social relations. The working class is able to play the role of the society's leading force not

only because of its numerical growth, connected with the development of the productive forces, but also because of qualitative changes in its complexion: its rising educational, technical and cultural level and its growing political activity. The working class under socialism plays the major role in running production, in the work of the organs of power both in the localities and at a high state level (the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics) and in the activity of diverse social organisations.

The cooperated peasantry (in the USSR, the collective farmers) is a class free from exploitation and from any survivals of petty-bourgeois proprietor individualism. Its educational level has been steadily rising, and a high sense of civic duty, collectivism and loyalty to the socialist cause are among its new features. As the nature of agricultural work changes with the switch to highly productive and highly mechanised work, the essential distinctions between the working conditions of urban workers and farmers in the countryside are gradually erased.

Significant changes also occur in the complexion of the socialist intelligentsia. It keeps growing numerically. As its new members come from among the working class and the collective farmers, it turns into a truly people's intelligentsia. In the conditions of developed socialism in the USSR, the intelligentsia has been growing rapidly through an influx of technical and other specialists with a higher or secondary education.

The changes that occur within the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia in the USSR with the perfection of developed socialism create the necessary prerequisites for the emergence of a new type of socio-political community, the Soviet people.

The erasure of essential distinctions between mental and manual work, and between town and country help to make the developed socialist society ever more socially homogeneous. And although that will take time, this tendency is already sufficiently pronounced, gathering momentum as the crucial and decisive tendency.

* * *

The Marxist view of the society's social structure singles out socio-class relations as its crucial, decisive characteristics.

It is solely on the basis of socio-class relations that one can explain the antagonistic and other contradictions which are the source of changes in the society's social structure and its development.

At the same time, the Marxist analysis of the social structure is not confined to these relations. Marxism also examines the correlation between the various classes, groups and strata of a given society on the strength of all the factors and conditions that determine their status in the social structure, on the strength of the distinctions between them and their common features, the tendencies of the changes in the social structure and its progressive development.

Chapter Five

THE SOCIETY AND POLITICS

Marx and Engels devoted much attention to the study of politics as a special social phenomenon. In elaborating the principles of their new approach to the society as an integral social organism. they also projected guidelines for the study of political life as a special sphere of human activity, determined by the class relations existing in the society.

Marx and Engels gave a brilliant analysis of political life in the bourgeois society in works like *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State,* etc.

In the 20th century, Lenin raised the traditions of Marxist political analysis to a new level, making a major contribution to the emergence of Marxist political theory as an independent scientific discipline. In many of his works (primarily *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, The State and Revolution,* and others), Lenin used the dialectical approach and the basic sociological principles of a scientific analysis of the class nature of politics, the essence of political relations, the state, and politics as a social phenomenon.

Before getting down to an examination of political problems, their formulation and solution in Marxist theory, let us first give a definition of politics.

1. POLITICS. CLASSES. THE STATE

Politics is a special sphere of activity connected with the relations between diverse social groups, classes and nations. The relations that take shape between people in that sphere of activity are known as *political relations.*

These relations emerge with the appearance of classes, with the society's division into antagonistic classes, and constitute the basis of the political organisation of the class society. In their most concentrated form, political relations manifest themselves in social life through the involvement of representatives from each class, group and nation in the functioning of the society's political organisation, in the affairs of state.

What is the society's political organisation? What is the state? What are its goals and purposes?

Marxist theory explains the origins and essence of the state, political relations, and their importance in social life on the strength of the scientific materialist conception of the society's class structure.

The emergence of classes and new social relations (political and legal) entrenching the class division of the society gave rise to a host of organisations and institutions whose task was to regulate these relations. The most important among them was the state.

The state arose and developed primarily as an instrument enabling one class to exercise political domination over other classes. Ever since the class society emerged thousands of years ago, the state has remained an instrument of political power in the hands of the ruling class (or several classes). No wonder that the concept of "politics" has traditionally been connected with state power. The types and forms of political organisation in societies divided into antagonistic classes have kept changing, but the essence of the state has always remained the same.

The state is the organisation of the political power of the ruling class. But in winning and retaining that power, in the struggle for its vital interests, the ruling class not only uses the state, but also sets up political parties, diverse non-government organisations, cooperatives, church and other institutions. All of these in their totality constitute *the society's political organisation*, that is, the system of institutions, establishments and other bodies which regulates the mutual relations between classes, nations and states in the sphere of politics. That sphere embraces: 1) political institutions and relations; 2) political consciousness; 3) political activity.

The core of the society's political organisation is the state, a complex and ramified mechanism of legislative, executive and

judicial institutions which enforces – through laws and other state acts – the power of the ruling class over all citizens without exception.

Diverse non-Marxist conceptions of the state accentuate its "contractual" and "supra-class" character. According to these conceptions, the state emerged and exists in consequence of the human awareness of the need for "order" and "mediation" in the society, where different interests come into collision; it is seen as a continuation of the abstract idea of justice, of the "unity" and "harmony" of these interests.

Such conceptions, however, merely serve to obscure the essence of the state. As Marxism has shown, the state is not an artificial entity rising over and above the society or imposed on it from outside. It is a product of the society's own development, a result of the changes that take place in the sphere of material social production. With the replacement of one mode of production by another, the form of state system changes accordingly. That is a general uniformity in the development of the state, of the society's political organisation, intrinsic to any antagonistic-class formation.

Type and form of the state. In the course of mankind's historical development, the state has kept changing, with one type of state system giving way to another. The forms of the state have changed as well.

The type of the state is determined by the predominant class, which wields its power to preserve and entrench the production relations that suit that class.

History has known *four main types of state*: slaveholding, feudal, capitalist and socialist. The first three of these are antagonistic, while the latter is non-antagonistic; it is a new type of state defending the interests of the whole people.

The form of state is the concrete organisation of state power. It is usually determined by many circumstances: the specific historical conditions of each country's development, the balance of class forces within it, and so on.

In the classless primitive-communal society, where social relations were regulated through tribal customs and traditions, there was as yet no need for a state as a special institution enabling some people to exercise power over others. Social power in that society directly coincided with the armed population, and

supreme power belonged to the general meeting. But with the development of production, the deepening of the division of labour, the emergence of private property in the means of production, and the resultant division of the society into classes, the tribal system and the related form of administration became obsolete. As Engels showed in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, the tribal form of government in that epoch gave way to the state.[1]

So, the state arose in view of the need to protect private property and the power of the propertied class, and to hold the oppressed classes in subjection. Consequently, the exploiter state is a political organisation of the economically predominant class designed for a struggle against the exploited, for a suppression of their resistance. The emergence of the state and its subsequent development involved an irreconcilable class struggle. Epochs, forms of private property, types of class structure and forms of power kept changing, but the essence of the exploiter state remained the same.

Distinctive features and functions of the state. The state is a major component of the superstructure that rises above the society's economic basis and serves to maintain, strengthen and defend the relations that constitute that basis.

As compared with the non-political system of governance that existed in the primitive-communal society, the state in a class society is characterised by three main features: so-called *public power* (a special privileged group of people governing other people; a bureaucracy, an army and a police force, punitive and intelligence organs, prisons, etc.—such are the main components of that coercive power and its instruments); *taxation of the population*, which is necessary to maintain the machinery of state power; and *territorial division*, which makes it easier to defend the interests of the ruling classes within the borders of a given territory.

Diverse forms of government first developed in the slaveholding society: monarchy (power of a monarch, an emperor), aristocracy (power of a minority), republic (electoral power), democracy (power of the majority). In spite of these diverse forms

[1] See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. Three, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p. 326.

of government, the state in that epoch remained a slaveholding state, for it upheld and defended the interests of one class: the slave-owners. Different forms of government also existed under feudalism, where states were either monarchies or republics. But that did not change the class essence of the feudal state, whose invariable purpose was to put down protest by the oppressed classes, the peasants and handicraftsmen.

Under capitalism, where the state exercises the rule of the bourgeoisie in every sphere of social life, it can be either a republic (the USA, Italy, etc.) or a monarchy, often constitutional (Britain, Spain, Sweden, etc.). Under imperialism, the bourgeoisie sometimes resorts to openly undemocratic forms of government in order to prevent or postpone the social and political transformations demanded by the working masses.

Even in the past few decades of the 20th century, the bourgeois ruling circles of a number of capitalist states have been known to install "strong", openly right-wing dictatorial regimes whenever the class struggle has risen to a particularly high pitch. Under the slogan of "defending national interests from the threat of international communism", these regimes brutally suppress any democratic movements of the working people in their countries, implant militarism, and follow a policy of revenge-seeking, aggressive military ventures, genocide and racism. Directly infringing upon spiritual values, culture, humanism and elementary human rights, these regimes ultimately pose a threat to the very class whose interests they are meant to serve. Just as in fascist Germany and Italy and in militarist Japan towards the end of the Second World War, so in Spain at the end of the Franco era (the 1960s and 1970s), in Chile in the 1970s, and in other states, members of the ruling classes (including the bourgeoisie) often joined the society's progressive forces in a vigorous struggle against the dictatorial regimes.

As an organisation of the ruling class, the antagonistic state also performs a whole range of *regulative functions,* aimed at consolidating the unity of that class and strengthening the foundations of the existing social system.

These functions include:

— the economic function (juridical regulation of property relations, drafting of labour legislation, etc.), and a related juridical function, which involves regulation of the whole totality

of social relations through a system of legalised (juridical) norms; both these functions are also functions of exploitation, of the economic and political suppression of the working masses;

—the function of regulating relations both between the exploiter classes in order to rally them together in their struggle against the opposing classes and in defence of their social system, and between the exploited classes;

—the function of defending the interests of the ruling class in international relations (external function).

For running the society and performing its functions, the state has a special apparatus. Since an exploitative system cannot exist without coercion of the working masses, it is inconceivable without a coercive apparatus, a special repression machine, which includes an army, an intelligence service, punitive organs and prisons.

Alongside the state apparatus, the ruling class also uses such an instrument of state power as law.

Law is a system of rules of conduct enshrined in legislation and sanctioned by the state. In regulating property rights and privileges, the exploiter state legalises not only the economic system of exploitation, but also the system of social relations determined by it (relations between classes and other social groups, the status of the family, various ethnic groups, national minorities and non-government organisations, civil rights and duties). In one form or another, law embraces every aspect and type of human activity in the society. With its help, the exploiter state ensures defence of private property and the vital interests of the ruling classes.

Special note should be taken of the state's external function. Foreign policy has always been a continuation of domestic policy. The reactionary aspirations of the exploiter classes in domestic policy are usually extended through an aggressive foreign-policy line. Through their colonial conquests, subjugation and plunder of other peoples in the late 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries, the ruling classes of a number of imperialist countries have acquired a vast sphere of exploitation and, consequently, immense profits.

At present, the ruling circles of the USA and other NATO countries, which safeguard the interests of the biggest monopolies, have been following a policy of headlong militarisation of

the economy and an arms drive, harbouring wild plans of global domination. That policy, however, is opposed by all peace-loving peoples, primarily the socialist community countries and the whole of progressive mankind.

2. PRESENT-DAY CAPITALISM: THE SOCIETY AND POLITICS

In analysing the tendencies of development at the monopoly stage of capitalism, Lenin showed that the evolution of the bourgeois state, the political organisation of the bourgeois society, leads to an "extraordinary strengthening of the 'state machine' and an unprecedented growth in its bureaucratic and military apparatus".[1]

Indeed, the political system of the antagonistic-class society reaches its peak under capitalism. The administrative system is perfected and the repressive apparatus, whose purpose is to combat democratic social movements, is invigorated in the conditions of a ceaseless class struggle.

The struggle between political parties, which advocate and defend the interests of various classes, is sharply intensified. The multiparty system of present-day capitalism is a logical product of the intractable contradictions between its classes and social strata.

True, the multiparty system enables some groups of the bourgeoisie to derive certain benefits from the struggle between various bourgeois parties on this or that issue. Since the ultimate goals of these parties coincide, the main distinctions between them are usually tactical. Skillful manipulation of the differences between parties creates a semblance of democracy, enabling the ruling class to change the contours of its policy without altering its essence.

Through the mass media (the press, radio, television), which have come to play a major role in political life under capitalism, the ruling elite exerts an active influence on the consciousness of diverse classes and strata. By manipulating that consciousness, it influences the country's public opinion as a whole.

Bourgeois politologists eulogise the democratic principles of the capitalist state. The fierce competition among the monopo-

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1977, p. 415.

lies, protection of the interests of oligarchic financial associations in politics (through the system of lobbyism in parliaments, overt and covert bribery, blackmail and other methods of influencing the state apparatus), and various forms of ideological control are often presented in their theories as a manifestation of the "democratic" principles of pluralist bourgeois democracy, whose vehicle is the capitalist state. Obscuring its essence as a dictatorship of the ruling monopoly elite and as an instrument for suppressing the working classes, present-day non-Marxist theorists maintain that the bourgeois state is gradually turning into the organising link of the whole of economic and social life in the society, with an "integration" of the interests of all its members on the basis of scientific planning of production, regulation of consumption, etc.[1]

These conceptions are being widely used by reformism, opportunism and right-wing revisionism in their urge to moderate the class struggle under present-day capitalism, to prove that there is no need for the working people to fight for their vital rights, and present the political development of capitalism as its evolution towards "pure democracy".

Life itself, however, refutes these essentially utopian illusions. As actual historical experience shows, democracy in a class society has always remained a class form of the organisation of political life. And it can never be otherwise. "If we are not to mock at common sense and history," Lenin wrote, "it is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure democracy' as long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy."[2]

The development of political life in our day shows ever greater authoritarian tendencies in the system of monopoly rule. The bourgeois state, which advocates the interests of the whole bourgeois class and does the will of the monopolies, turns into a kind of committee for running the affairs of monopoly capital. The actual policy of bourgeois states refutes the democratic freedoms and values they proclaim, although many of these are written into the constitutions of these states. Real rights and freedoms there are concentrated solely in the hands of the bourgeoi-

[1] See Peter L. Berger, Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality*, London, 1967, p. 18 ff.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, 1977, p. 242.

sie, the class that exercises economic, political and ideological domination, whereas for a vast majority of the working people these widely advertised rights and freedoms are nothing but a dead letter.

Millions of unemployed, growing numbers of homeless constantly on the move in search of jobs and housing, the unavailability for many people of adequate guaranteed medical services and pension security in old age or disability, the fact that specialised and higher education is beyond the reach of most representatives of the less-well-off groups and strata, persecution of those who take part in progressive public and political organisations, in the struggle for peace, against aggressive tendencies in foreign policy and an anti-popular line in domestic policy, and an offensive against all the gains of the working people—such is the real picture of the "guaranteed" rights and freedoms which are being widely advertised but never put into practice by the capitalist states.

Under state-monopoly capitalism, the development of political life is determined by two interconnected, though diametrically opposite tendencies. The first of these is connected, as it has already been noted, with the toughening dictatorship of the ruling classes, their growing domination and resort to violence, which manifests itself both in the domestic and foreign policy of the capitalist states, and the second, with the rise of a broad revolutionary and anti-monopoly movement.

3. THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND REVOLUTION

In answer to the bourgeois states' offensive against their vital rights, the working classes of the capitalist society and their allies come out in a common front of struggle against the reactionary political line pursued in the interests of the monopolies. Now as in the past, the working people's class struggle is spearheaded against that line, aiming to limit the power of the monopolies and consolidate all the progressive forces advocating peace, democracy and profound social transformations. These just goals of the working people's class struggle raise the question about the ways of such transformations, which could put an end to the sway of the monopolies, to the economic, political, social and other forms of man's exploitation of man.

In its highest form, the class struggle is a political struggle and leads to *revolution, or a radical upheaval in the social and state system.* Revolution puts an end to the obsolete social system and asserts a new and progressive one, eliminating private property in the means of production and the exploitation of the working masses.

Marxist social theory regards revolutions as the supreme manifestation of the class struggle in an antagonistic society. In elaborating the main propositions of the Marxist theory of the class struggle, Lenin showed that since it is a political struggle it inevitably raises the *question of power.* The first and essential feature of a revolution is transition of state power from the hands of one class to those of another.

The transition period: the question of power. Whereas the bourgeois revolution brought to power the capitalist class and established the capitalist system, which for the toiling classes meant no more than a change of form of exploitation, the proletarian revolution carried out by the working class in alliance with all the other working people overthrows the power of the ruling class together with the capitalist system. In *The State and Revolution,* written on the eve of the October Revolution in Russia, Lenin showed on the strength of a wide array of facts that the working class can only ensure the working people's revolutionary gains by taking power into its own hands and establishing, in one form or another, a dictatorship of the proletariat.

What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? Is it no more than coercion by the triumphant working class of all the other classes, groups and strata of the society, "inevitable" in economically backward, underdeveloped countries?

Not at all. Petty-bourgeois and reformist theorists seek to prove that there is "no need" for a proletarian dictatorship in countries where the traditions of bourgeois parliamentarianism make it possible to rise to socialism without dismantling the old state machine. But that is a grave delusion. The experience of many revolutions, including the defeat of the Chilean revolution in 1973, shows that the working masses have to pay dearly for such delusions.

Having analysed mankind's first experience of that kind, the experience of the 1871 Paris Commune, Marx drew the following conclusion: in the period of revolutionary transition from

capitalism to socialism, "the state can be nothing but the *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*".[1]

In the epoch of imperialism, the highest and final stage of capitalism, Lenin scientifically substantiated the proposition that the proletariat can attain its goals in the course of a revolution solely with the direct support of all the other, non-proletarian strata of the working people. The dictatorship of the proletariat, he emphasised, is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat as the vanguard of all the working people and their numerous non-proletarian strata, an alliance led by the working class. The need for such an alliance, he pointed out, stems both from the peculiarities of the period of revolutionary transformations and from its tasks: the tasks of overthrowing the old system and strengthening the new, socialist system. Developing in a fierce and ceaseless struggle against reformists and opportunists, who denied the need for a proletarian dictatorship in the revolutionary period, the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat became a touchstone for testing the attitude to Marxism of those who supported it in practice. To consider oneself a Marxist, Lenin wrote, it is not enough to recognise the class struggle; it is also necessary to extend one's recognition of the class struggle to a *recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat*.[2]

The dictatorship of the proletariat as a form of power in the transition period not only implies an effort to overcome the resistance of the bourgeoisie and its allies, who seek to prevent the assertion of the new social system (or even their suppression, if they come out against the people's power), but also includes diverse types of constructive—economic, organisational, cultural, educational, foreign-policy (defence, struggle for peace)—activity by the state, aimed at strengthening its economic, political and social foundations, at ensuring the necessary conditions for the people's efficient labour in building a socialist society.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a whole system of state, political and social bodies and institutions, united and directed by the proletarian, Marxist-Leninist party. Its leading and guiding role in the system of proletarian dictatorship and its con-

[1] Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. Three, p.26.

[2] See V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 420.

sistent policy based on scientific cognition and use of the laws of social development are the crucial and decisive condition of the proletariat's historical mission.

Depending on the actual historical conditions of individual countries, the forms of proletarian dictatorship can differ widely. But whatever the distinctions, its binding and characteristic feature is that the whole process of socialist construction is directed by a Marxist-Leninist party, the vanguard of the working class and all the working masses. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a historically new *type of democracy,* qualitatively distinct from all earlier types: *democracy by the majority* of the people, based on their broad involvement in running the society and the affairs of state.

Having generalised the experience of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle in Russia, Lenin saw the Soviets as a form of the state of proletarian dictatorship. The Soviets are the largest mass organisation which embraces all the working people of the country.

After the Second World War, revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries gave rise to a new form of proletarian dictatorship: the *people's democracy.* Its specific feature is the multiparty political system. The leading role in that system belongs to the Marxist-Leninist party, with a broad popular front uniting diverse classes, groups and strata which recognise the leading role of the working class and its party. That form of proletarian dictatorship is marked by gradual, peaceful development, without any forcible expropriation of the propertied classes.

The changes in the world balance of forces in favour of socialism and the international working class, and the upsurge of the national liberation movement have extended the possibilities for a peaceful course of the socialist revolution. But whether it will develop along such a course largely depends on the degree and intensity of the resistance put up by the bourgeoisie, on the specific conditions of each people's revolutionary struggle. That is why the dictatorship of the proletariat can take diverse forms in different countries.

The ultimate goal of any form of proletarian dictatorship is to transform the society on revolutionary lines: to eliminate capitalism and build socialism. As Lenin noted, "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not

exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat. . ."[1]

4. SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

As socialism is being built, the state of proletarian dictatorship gradually evolves into a state of the whole people.

The whole people's state is a political organisation of the whole people led by the working class and its vanguard, the communist party. The social base of the political system of socialism keeps expanding and changing in qualitative terms, for it is not only the working class, but also the peasantry and the intelligentsia that become consistently socialist, i.e., take a fully working-class stand and assimilate the working-class ideology.

The main internal functions of the whole people's socialist state are economic and cultural. Its external function is intrinsically free of territorial imperial ambitions, of an urge for aggression, for the economic or political enslavement of other peoples. Its major goals remain defence of the homeland and of the socialist community countries, struggle for peace and stronger international solidarity, support for the struggle of the oppressed peoples, economic and cultural cooperation with all countries and peoples. Then there are also the tasks of an irreconcilable ideological struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology alien to the socialist society, against any encroachments upon the working people's socialist gains, and against imperialism.

The whole people's state continues to deepen and perfect socialist democracy. That process is expressed in:

—the growing role of the organs of people's power (the Soviets of People's Deputies) in the solution of economic, social and cultural problems, in the efforts to involve all citizens in running the affairs of the society and the state;

—the overall development of democracy in solving production and economic problems connected with planning and control of enterprise activity at the local level; in the USSR, that

[1] V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, 1977, pp. 69-70.

process was particularly promoted by the Law on Work Collectives, which gave the working people a greater say in the affairs of their enterprises;

—the growing role of the trade unions, of youth, cooperative and other mass organisations, cultural and educational associations and creative unions in the discussion and resolution both of state matters and those relating to the Soviet people's daily life.

The Communist Party remains the organising force, the core of all the political, ideological and social work among the masses aimed at promoting democracy under developed socialism. The party's importance as the political vanguard of the working class and all the other working people has been growing and will continue to grow as the developed socialist society is being perfected and advances towards communism.

The USSR has a one-party system.[1] There is no need here for other political parties, because the CPSU represents the interests of the whole people—the working class, the collective farmers and the working intelligentsia, rallying round itself all the working people.

At the same time, other socialist countries (Bulgaria, Poland, the GDR, Czechoslovakia) have a multiparty system. With the Marxist-Leninist workers' parties playing the leading role, the other parties in each of these countries represent the specific interests of separate groups and strata of the population and cooperate with the ruling parties as an active link in the political organisation of the socialist society.

So, no matter how hard certain critics seek to distort the picture of political life under existing socialism, its diverse experience shows that there is no single "model" of political system. On the contrary, there is a variety of forms of political or-

[1] There is also a one-party system in the socialist Republic of Romania. In the USSR, such a system took shape after the October Revolution of 1917, but not as a result of suppression of other parties by force, as some anti-Soviet and anti-communist ideologues allege. In the new conditions, many of the then existing bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties began losing their social base, losing touch with the masses, and so quickly disappeared from the political scene. Some parties put themselves outside the law by their openly hostile activity against the Soviet power, the power of the working people.

ganisation, reflecting the rich content of socialist democracy, which exists for the people.

Socialist democracy is the highest type of political democracy. It assures all citizens of real equality before the law, direct and equal suffrage by secret ballot. Socialist democracy, whose social basis consists of social property in the means of production, is the groundwork for man's true economic and social emancipation. For the first time in mankind's history, socialism gives the working masses access to independent involvement in state administration through their activity in work collectives, through diverse public organisations, the practice of nationwide discussion of draft laws, and the people's control system. Apart from proclaiming political freedoms and socio-economic rights, the Constitution of the USSR ensures reliable guarantees of these rights and freedoms in practice. That is the essential distinction between socialist and bourgeois democracy.

As socialist democracy is deepened and extended in every respect with the further perfection of developed socialism, the state will eventually give way to communist social self-government, which is already beginning to take shape.

* * *

An analysis of political life from the standpoint of the class approach, which lies at the root of Marxist social theory, shows the complexity of the problems of power, the state, forms of government, democracy, revolutionary transformations, etc., examined by that theory.

At the same time, the world revolutionary process in our day shows these problems to be highly imperative. Examples of how they should be studied in the light of the correlation and struggle between classes are contained in the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, in its social theory.

Chapter Six

SOCIAL REVOLUTION

We have already considered the prerequisites, motive forces and uniformities of radical revolutionary change in history. Let us now examine this question in greater detail.

The change of socio-economic formation is always a fundamental, qualitative leap, which affects all aspects of life in the society, transforming its basis and superstructure. That is why such leaps are called social revolutions.

1. SOCIAL REVOLUTION: ESSENCE AND PREREQUISITES

In his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx wrote: "At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or—this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms—with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution."[1]

Social revolution is a turning point in every sphere of the society's life without exception, in the whole social system. Such a revolution does not occur all at once, but can last for years and decades. One of its key elements is a political revolution, which includes a fundamental transformation of the state system. Its main goal is to change the society's political system. Social revolution, which is a whole period of deep-going, radical transformations in the society, spreads to all its spheres: qualitatively new economic and social structures, political, legal, ideological and other relations arise and develop in the society.

[1] Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p. 21.

As a fundamental, qualitative leap in the society's development, social revolution means its total renewal. Although present-day non-Marxist philosophy and sociology assert that the theories of revolution are outdated because the society's development today is nearly totally determined by the controlled influence of scientifically substantiated government policy on the economy, ideology and politics, the process of radical revolutionary transformations in the world continues to unfold. We have witnessed numerous revolutions connected with the disintegration of the world colonial system and the emergence of new independent national states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many of these anti-imperialist revolutions marked the beginning of a new period in the life of the countries entering the road of independent political, economic and social development, the road of building the new society.

Marxist social theory brings out and explains the basic prerequisites and uniformities of revolutionary transformations in social life. In giving a scientific explanation of the essence of social revolutions, their role in mankind's history, their origins and development uniformities, Marxist theory invalidates the conceptions that deny, underestimate or question the importance of social revolutions. Present-day bourgeois sociologists keep making such attempts, offering their own conceptions of managerial revolution, revolution in consciousness, sexual revolution, and so on. All these attempts reveal one main tendency: a striving to substitute pseudo-scientific deliberations about ways of "improving" capitalism for the Marxist understanding of the essence of revolution.

Social revolution is a natural and law-governed phenomenon, determined by the material conditions of life in the society, by its internal development contradictions. These contradictions do not manifest themselves right away, but accumulate gradually, reaching a mature stage. The period in which these contradictions mature is known as the period of preparation of social revolution. In that period, the society does not stand still and its development does not cease: new productive forces emerge and mature within the entrails of the old ones, and there are changes in the relations of production, which influence the balance of class forces, the economy, ideology and culture (evolutionary changes).

These gradual, evolutionary changes pave the way for a fundamental, qualitative leap forward, or social revolution.

In a correct assessment of the importance of evolutionary periods in the society's development (as periods of gradual and partial changes, whose accumulation leads to the stage of fundamental transformations, to revolution), Marxist social theory emphatically rejects any attempts to reduce the process of social development to evolutionary changes alone. Ever since the days of Herbert Spencer, who laid the foundations of social evolutionism, and right up to our day (theories of social evolution connected with structural functionalism, etc.), non-Marxist sociology has been inclined to dismiss social revolutions as "useless" and even "harmful".[1] Nevertheless, revolutions prepared by the objective prerequisites of social development do occur.

The most important of these prerequisites is the conflict between the new productive forces and the old, obsolete relations of production. In order to bring these production relations up to the level of the productive forces, it is necessary to resolve the conflict between them. In a society torn apart by antagonistic contradictions, that conflict manifests itself in a collision between classes. The ruling class, which owns the means of production, defends the old production relations and the social system that rests on these, while other (revolutionary) classes strive to overthrow that system, to replace it with a new and more progressive one. The conflict between these classes is ultimately resolved through social revolution, in the course of which radical transformations take place in the economic, social, cultural and other spheres of life.

In order fully to eliminate the production relations which need replacing and which prop up the old social system, the progressive class, which is interested in completing the revolutionary transformations, should win political power.

The question of state power and its passage from one class to another, as it was noted above, is the main question of any revolution. It is not merely a matter of power changing hands, as it usually happens in various superficial coups, which only change the configuration of the groups in power. Such a trans-

[1] Spencer was the first bourgeois sociologist who, in identifying the society with a natural living organism, spoke of revolution as a social "disease".

fer of power is possible when one reactionary regime is replaced by another. The question of struggle for power in the course of a revolution is a question of overthrowing the power of the outgoing social forces, primarily the ruling class, and establishing the power of the class that is the hegemonic force in that particular revolution. The struggle in this case can either involve coercion or not. The concrete conditions of the revolution engender concrete forms of the struggle for power. A revolution can occur without an armed clash between classes, but its subsequent development and expansion could lead to sharp confrontations between the winning and losing classes, which could result in counterrevolutionary revolts, civil war, etc.

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia was relatively bloodless, and for a few months the Soviet power literally marched in triumph across the country. Nevertheless, the peaceful course of the revolution was soon disrupted by a civil war and an armed intervention from abroad.

The development of social revolutions is determined by a complicated set of internal and external contradictions. Internal contradictions between antagonistic classes remain decisive, but external contradictions (those connected with interstate relations) can also have a considerable influence on the course of a revolution, either slowing down or accelerating its development. Some revolutions (such as national liberation revolutions) resolve both internal and external contradictions by destroying the reactionary classes inside the country and, together with these, the forms of enslavement imposed on the country by foreign capital with the help of these classes.

2. REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION

For a social revolution to take place, there should be definite objective and subjective prerequisites and historical conditions, for revolutions cannot be made to order or imported from outside. *The sum total of objective conditions necessary for revolution creates a revolutionary situation.*

A revolutionary situation is characterised by a whole number of symptoms. In analysing these, Lenin noted that a revolution is simply impossible without a nationwide crisis.[1] On the

[1] V. I. Lenin. "'Left-Wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 1982, p. 85.

one hand, that means a crisis of the "upper classes", i.e., an impossibility for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change, and on the other, ferment among the oppressed, working classes, a crisis of the "lower classes", which do not want to live in the old way any longer. In such a situation, the want and misery of the exploited classes reach an extreme.

The crisis conditions help to invigorate political activity among the masses, stimulating their revolutionary mood.

So, the main symptoms of a revolutionary situation are: (1) a crisis of the policy of the ruling classes, which can no longer rule in the old way; (2) a worsening of the working people's material condition; (3) an upsurge in the independent political activity of the working people. Revolutionary periods in history are distinguished by rapid and profound social transformations precisely because these transformations are carried out by the masses. Mass action brings about the most radical socio-economic and political changes.

If a revolutionary situation is to culminate in a revolution, the necessary objective conditions should be combined with a mature subjective factor, i.e., the consciousness, ideological maturity and good organisation of the progressive social class, which acts in alliance with other classes and strata against the policy of the ruling class.

A unity of objective and subjective conditions is the main law of social revolution.

3. THE CHARACTER AND MOTIVE FORCES OF REVOLUTIONS

Revolutions differ in *social character,* which is determined by what kind of social contradictions are resolved by a particular revolution; what social system is established as a result of its victory; what are the motive forces of the revolution; and who plays the leading role in the revolutionary transformations.

Revolutions are usually headed by one particular class, which is the leader, or *hegemonic class,* of a given revolution. That class unites the other classes, groups and strata which are its allies in the struggle for a radical, revolutionary transformation of the society.

The social classes that carry out a revolution are its motive

forces. The revolution's motive forces and hegemonic class depend on its character and on the historical conditions in which it takes place.

The history of revolutions has known revolutionary uprisings by slaves and serfs, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic and national liberation revolutions, and socialist, proletarian revolutions. Alongside general features which are common to all revolutions, each revolution has its own specific features. When similar tasks are being resolved in different historical settings, the depth of the social transformations, the motive forces, and the forms of class struggle can markedly differ from one country to another.

The national liberation revolutions of our day are extremely diverse in form and content. In uniting different social groups and classes, which form a common front in the struggle for political, economic and social independence, the revolutionary movement of the young states of Africa, Asia and Latin America helps to deepen and develop the global anti-imperialist revolutionary process.

Towards the highest type of social revolution. Ours is an epoch of social revolutions. The world revolutionary process in our day continues to develop with the peoples' struggle for lasting peace, independence and a better future, against any forms of inequality and oppression.

The leading place in that process now belongs to *socialist revolutions—the highest type of social revolution*, effecting a transition from the capitalist to the communist socio-economic formation.

Owing to its status in the system of capitalist production, the working class is the vanguard and the main motive force of the socialist revolution. As a radical transformation of all spheres of the society without exception, that revolution lasts throughout the whole *transition period*, from the moment when the working class wins political power to the building of socialism. The first necessary prerequisite of a socialist revolution is the take-over of power by the working class and establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. That take-over provides a basis for all subsequent economic, social and other transformations in the course of the socialist revolution.

Depending on the historical conditions and on the balance of class forces in a given society, the *forms* of socialist revolution

can differ markedly. It can follow either a peaceful or a non-peaceful course. In the first instance, as in the East European countries after the Second World War, the balance of forces in favour of the working class was a prerequisite for a relatively peaceful and gradual development of socialist revolutions. The peaceful way of revolution is now open to many countries in view of the existence of the world socialist system, the balance of forces in favour of socialism and progress, and the growing might of anti-imperialist and democratic movements in the world. But even here one cannot rule out a non-peaceful course of the revolution—in the event that the reactionary forces, the propertied classes, deprived of their privileges, encroach upon the working people's gains or resort to open violence against the masses. The working class and its allies should be able to uphold and defend the gains of the socialist revolution.

The socialist revolution creates all the necessary conditions for a radical reconstruction of the society, making it possible to resolve its economic, social and other conflicts and contradictions.

* * *

To sum up, let us note that:

—political problems occupy a central place in Marxist social theory;

—the elaboration of these problems by its founders and their followers is among the generally recognised achievements of Marxist analysis;

—the Marxist-Leninist conception of the state is an instrument for a scientific explanation of the power system under capitalism, the problems of revolution and the transition period, the political organisation of the society under socialism, and urgent problems of international relations.

Many political events in our day are connected with changes in the society's cultural life. After all, social transformations are simply impossible without changes in the sphere of culture, without a spiritual renewal.

Chapter Seven

THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE

The problems of culture, its role and place in the society's life have acquired special urgency. Present-day social development involves significant changes in all spheres of life without exception, including culture.

Culture is studied by different sciences, such as ethnography, sociology and anthropology, each under its own angle. In any case, all of these analyse the functioning and development of culture in the context of human life in the society. And that is only natural, for the society and culture are closely interconnected by numerous relations. These relations take shape between people, who create culture and transform the society in which they live.

1. CULTURE: THE CONCEPT DEFINED

The diversity of cultural phenomena and the different approaches to an analysis of culture are reflected in the plurality of the concept of culture itself. In effect, it characterises any aspect of human activity: labour and daily life, production relations, rest and leisure, upbringing, education, science and art. Even in daily usage culture may mean different things, which shows that the phenomena it encompasses are highly diverse. But whatever the distinctions between the various readings of the concept, both scientific and conventional, one could say that culture is always a definite result of human activity.

That is why the initial and most general definition of culture is all that has been created by man as distinct from everything connected with nature. Such a view makes it possible to see culture in the unity of its material and spiritual aspects, and that is important because not only pre-Marxist, but also many present-day non-Marxist trends in philosophy and sociology present the development of culture solely as a spiritual process, as the

history of the human spirit. In that way, spiritual culture is detached from its causes: from material life and human activity, from the producers of material and spiritual values.

Culture originated as a result of human production activity, when people began to master the forces of nature, going over from the use of ready-made natural products to the production of material values. So, the basis for culture was provided by the human labour process itself, whose development led to a demarcation between the material and spiritual spheres of production.

Material production embodied the power of human knowledge (the means of production, instruments of labour, machinery, etc.).

Spiritual production created spiritual culture. One of its components is the collective (social) consciousness, a special world of ideas as distinct from the world of things. Spiritual culture includes social psychology, ideology, science, art, politics, philosophy, man's ethical and aesthetic consciousness (the social consciousness is examined in greater detail in Chapter Eight).

There is a close dialectical interconnection between material and spiritual culture. Material culture has an ideological aspect and, vice versa, spiritual culture has a material aspect, for many spiritual phenomena (scientific knowledge, literature, fine arts, etc.) have a definite material embodiment. All of these could not have been created without material instruments and conditions, without living human individuals. Just as material production is impossible without the experience and knowledge of those who are engaged in it, so the production of spiritual values calls for definite material conditions.

Interpenetration of the material and the spiritual is thus a necessary factor in the functioning of culture and its development. Their interconnection is particularly evident in our day in such a sphere of culture as scientific knowledge. As the integrating element that brings together material and spiritual production, science is the major spiritual source of material production. Scientific knowledge accelerates the development of social production, engenders ever new industries and helps to restructure and renew the existing ones. The impact of science on progress in various fields of technology and social production, on the life of modern man is so great that a special concept—the *scientific and technical revolution* (STR)—has been introduced to characterise that influence. In Marxist theory, the STR is seen as

a necessary prerequisite for the development of production and culture as a whole.

Marxist social theory connects culture with living, creative human activity. It emphasises the organic unity of the material and spiritual aspects of human culture. Marx wrote in his *Capital*: "As in the natural body head and hand wait upon each other, so the labour-process unites the labour of the hand with that of the head."[1] Material and spiritual values, human culture are a natural result of that process.

The close interdependence of material and spiritual processes in the development of culture was brought out by Lenin, who deepened the Marxist view on cultural problems in examining the ways and perspectives of social development in the 20th century. He was the one who formulated and resolved a whole range of crucial cultural problems, such as the problem of continuity in the development of spiritual culture or that of a cultural revolution as a major aspect (alongside economics and politics) of the radical transformations in the society on the way from capitalism to socialism.

After the October Revolution in Russia, Lenin focussed his attention on these problems. In order to build a new society, it is not enough to transform the economic basis and build a new, socialist superstructure. It was necessary, Lenin wrote, critically to assimilate and put within the reach of the broadest strata of the working masses the successes of science and technology and the achievements of literature and fine arts accumulated by mankind, constantly to develop and enrich these achievements. He emphasised that the solution of any economic, political or other problems in the course of building socialism was connected with the vigorous and creative activity of the toiling classes, the prime productive force of the new society, with their ability to carry on that construction on the strength of profound knowledge and culture.[2]

And today, in the conditions of developed socialism in the USSR, when it is particularly important to optimise social production, to ensure a timely and competent solution of any economic issue, and to boost the initiative and consciousness of the

[1] Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 476.

[2] See V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 287.

masses, matters of cultural policy have acquired particular social importance. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet state have put that policy on a scientific basis, with due account for all that is valuable in this respect in the works of the founders of Marxist social theory.

In turning to the initial prerequisites of human culture and its development, which lie in the sphere of material production, Marxist theory shows the multidimensional nature of the concept of culture. From the Marxist standpoint, culture is a *dialectical unity of the results of human material and spiritual activity*. That is why it can also be seen as a definite level in the development of man and the society, since any aspect of human activity in the society—material (labour and production culture, technical level, etc.) or spiritual (development of the arts, science and knowledge, their spread in the society)—is also characterised by a definite level of human mastery of the results of that activity.

So, *culture is a historically determined level in the development of man and the society, expressed in the types and forms of the organisation of human life and activity, and in the material and spiritual values being created*. Such a definition of "culture" supplements and specifies the definition given at the beginning of this chapter (as all that is created by people as distinct from that which they get from nature). It also makes it possible to register the social specifics of various cultural phenomena with a view to their interconnection. That is particularly important, since culture in any society combines highly diverse elements: alongside progressive achievements, it also includes various elements connected with survivals of the past (traditions, customs, ideas, notions, standards of behaviour, etc.), with the contradictions that mark the relations existing in the sphere of material and spiritual production.

Such contradictions in the life of the present-day capitalist society are reflected in a polarisation of two cultures within it: "highbrow", or elitist culture, which exists for a select minority (educated and privileged groups and strata) and so-called mass culture, catering for "lowbrow" consumer demands and seeking to instill into the minds of broad strata of the working people simplified (and often openly primitive) views, ideas and life values. Presenting that polarisation as everlasting and intrinsic to

any society, non-Marxist philosophy and sociology of culture distort the actual state of affairs, so trying to vindicate capitalism, under which the contradictions of material social production inevitably engender contradictions in the sphere of social consciousness, spiritual life and culture as a whole.

In analysing the state of culture under capitalism and pointing out two opposite tendencies within it—a reactionary one, expressing the interests of the exploiter elite, and a progressive one, expressing the aspirations of the working people—Lenin showed the main source of cultural contrasts in the bourgeois society, which lies in the relations between its antagonistic classes. These socio-class antagonisms are fully overcome under socialism. As a socialist basis is being built, progressive changes also take place in the ramified system of superstructural relations, which has a beneficial effect on the emergence and development of a new, socialist culture.

We shall eventually return to the interconnection between the processes of social reconstruction and cultural development under socialism, and now let us take a closer look at the problem of cultural contrasts. It remains an urgent issue under socialism as well, where diverse survivals of the past are still present in vestigial form. With the victory of a socialist revolution, these survivals cannot be eliminated automatically. The "birthmarks" of capitalism and earlier formations manifest themselves in economic life, in the mentality and behaviour of a section of the people. Hence the instances of a dishonest attitude to work and to social property, anti-social behaviour, nationalist, religious and individualist views, breaches of the socialist norms of community living and legality, of the new society's moral principles. Socialist culture has been carrying on a tireless and resolute struggle against these survivals. The development of socialist social relations, of the socialist way of life, and the gradual formation of the new man help to create an atmosphere of a generally irreconcilable attitude to these survivals, so that they are being gradually overcome.

The social content and value of a culture are determined by the degree of its penetration into every sphere of human activity, relations between people, and social life as a whole. Such is the angle from which one should look at the interconnection between culture and the society, the correlation between culture

and civilisation, and its place in the process of social development.

Since the debate started by present-day non-Marxist philosophers and theorists of culture centres on these problems, let us see how each of these is formulated and resolved in Marxist social theory.

2. CULTURE AND CIVILISATION

Idealistic theories, which regard culture solely from the angle of the spiritual essence of its constituents, tend to contrast "culture" and "civilisation". Starting with the theories of Alfred Weber and Oswald Spengler, such a contrast reflects a specific view of the correlation between the material (civilisation) and the spiritual (culture) in the life of the society. Culture as a special spiritual entity, integral and continuous in its development, is contrasted with civilisation as a world of science and technology passed on from one society to another, a world of utilitarian, standardised means and methods of meeting daily human needs. Such contrasts, which can be traced back to the German philosophy of life (Friedrich Nietzsche, Oswald Spengler, Georg Simmel), are still used by anthropologically oriented trends of non-Marxist philosophy and sociology to interpret the crisis tendencies of culture and the society under capitalism. That is also reflected in anti-technical and similar conceptions accentuating the hostility to man of modern bourgeois culture and civilisation, which cannot meet his vital needs.

It was Marx and Engels who pointed out the fallacy of the contrast between culture and civilisation, and between culture and the society. They saw *civilisation* as a part of culture, as the material expression of man's creative and constructive activity, showing the emergence of civilisation in the context of the historical development of that activity and connecting that process with the ever deepening division of labour in the society and the emergence of classes. Civilisation, Engels noted, is that stage in the development of the society "at which division of labour, the resulting exchange between individuals, and commodity production, which combines the two, reach their complete unfoldment and revolutionise the whole hitherto existing society".[1]

[1] Frederick Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. Three, p. 330.

The Marxist approach calls for an analysis of the type of civilisation connected with this or that socio-economic formation. In accordance with that approach, the concept of "civilisation" means a historically determined phase, or stage, in the development of the society, the level of its material and spiritual culture. Each socio-economic formation is marked by a corresponding type of civilisation (the slaveholding, or ancient, civilisation, the capitalist civilisation, etc.) and its own culture. That is why one can single out different historically concrete *types* of culture.

Since the level of culture is determined by the total conditions and prerequisites both of material and spiritual production intrinsic to a particular socio-economic formation, a socio-historical analysis of culture is part of the study of any formation. An analysis of culture in the context of each socio-economic formation as a developing social system helps to understand the specifics of the main stages in the development of mankind's culture. After all, the succession of these stages can be seen as a succession of different types of culture.

The successive types of culture include: pre-class culture (the culture of the primitive-communal society); the cultures of the class-antagonistic formations (ancient, feudal and capitalist culture); and the culture of the communist formation (including socialist culture).

Each of these major historical types of culture is determined by the development level of material production, by the conditions of human life in a given society, whose influence leads to changes in people's world outlook, in their mentality and behaviour, their attitude to the surrounding world and their own creative cultural endeavour. In other words, the development of culture is determined by all the aspects of human social life and activity in their totality.

The development of culture is a historically continuous process. The source of its *continuity* is to be found in the goals and results of man's cultural creative endeavour. These are objectively determined by the conditions of human vital activity and are connected with the change of generations.

In touching upon the question of generations and their place in social and cultural development, Marx and Engels noted that the surrounding world "is not a thing given direct from all eternity, remaining ever the same . . . it is an historical product, the

result of the activity of a whole succession of generations, each standing on the shoulders of the preceding one, developing its industry and its intercourse, and modifying its social system according to the changed needs".[1] So, the continuity of generations provides a basis for continuity in the development of the society and culture.

In dealing with matters relating to the continuity of culture and its development, many non-Marxist philosophers and sociologists in our day recognise that under capitalism, which is going through a profound crisis of spiritual values, the link between the past and the present is being ruptured, cultural traditions are being violated, and culture is losing its continuity. Noting that rupture, Daniel Bell looks for the sources of the instability of present-day capitalism, the causes of its crisis in the ever greater erosion of traditional moral, religious and cultural values. According to him, the crisis of present-day culture is due to the discontinuity of its traditions, which is a consequence of the widening gap between the present and the spiritual experience of the past.[2]

Other non-Marxist philosophers and sociologists, advocating "generation dynamics" in the development of culture and the society which go back to the ideas and conceptions of Max Scheler, José Ortega y Gasset and Carl Mannheim, are looking for ways to overcome the crisis tendencies of cultural life under capitalism through a complete and resolute break with the discredited social and cultural values of the past. Among the most insistent advocates of such a "break" were the ideologues of the left-radical and student movements of the recent past, who started out from the conceptions of Herbert Marcuse, Norman O. Brown, Theodore Roszak, Paul Goodman, Timothy Leary and other theorists of "counterculture".

In accentuating the need to reject the values of bourgeois culture, by means of which the society integrates the individual into the capitalist social organisation and turns him into an obedient performer of alien "roles", norms and instructions, the ideologues of youth "protests" were nevertheless unable to come up

[1] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "The German Ideology", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 39.

[2] See Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, Basic Books, New York, 1976, p. 100.

with a consistent programme for drawing the younger generation into the struggle for a fundamental reconstruction of the capitalist society.[1]

3. TRANSFORMATION OF THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE

The problem of cultural continuity is closely tied in with the question about the ways of transforming the society itself. A revolution in the economic, political and other fields of life is bound to entail deep-going, fundamental changes in culture, or a cultural revolution.

The cultural revolution is a part of the socialist revolution, which marks the transition from capitalism to socialism. Marx and Engels did not make a special examination of cultural revolution problems, although they clearly pointed out an approach to their solution. In elaborating the theory of socialist revolution, Lenin devoted much attention to the question of cultural transformations in the society. Thus, he spoke of such transformations in the course of building socialism in the USSR in an article entitled "On Co-operation" (1923); he was also the one who coined the term "cultural revolution".

The proletariat, which scored a victory in the October Revolution of 1917, had to rehabilitate the economy of young Soviet Russia, devastated by the civil war and the armed foreign intervention by the imperialist states, to organise labour and the running of production on new lines, and set up cultural institutions to serve the interests of the broadest working masses. To fulfil these and other tasks of cultural construction in that period, it was necessary to do a great deal of day-to-day work in order to transform all aspects of life in the society, to form a new attitude to work among its members, a new social discipline, and a new socialist consciousness.

Lenin connected the tasks of economic construction with those

[1] That was particularly pronounced in *The Greening of America,* a book by Charles Reich, who developed many of the central ideas of the "revolution in consciousness", substantiating the essentially individualistic forms of the "countercultural" protest of the young against the moral standards of present-day capitalism, protest which is largely confined to a struggle for a partial transformation of that society, without its fundamental reconstruction (Charles Reich, *The Greening of America,* Random House, New York, 1973).

of forming a new type of culture. He actually equated the concepts of "communism" and "culture", thus emphasising the immense importance of cultural construction for the triumph of socialism and communism.

In substantiating the major propositions of the programme for building a new culture, Lenin deepened and developed the Marxist understanding of continuity in the development of human culture in general. He resolutely rejected any attempts at a "radical" denial of the cultural heritage of the past, showing that it belongs to the whole people and that it can and must serve cultural development of the masses. Lenin saw the formation of a new and progressive culture of the whole people as a condition of building socialism.

Lenin's plan for a cultural revolution was meant to create conditions for the formation of such a culture of the whole people. To form such a culture, it was first of all necessary to sweep away the obsolete cultural traditions and principles inherited from the days when the society's material and spiritual life was still dominated by the reactionary classes. These traditions were to be eradicated by a cultural revolution.

What is the cultural revolution?

It is a renewal of culture through fundamental social transformations. The cultural revolution marks a turning point in the society's spiritual life, in its development. The goal of the cultural revolution is to assert new and progressive ideals, convictions and spiritual values, and to educate a new man. That is why, while sweeping away all that is obsolete and reactionary, the cultural revolution also creates conditions for the spiritual development of each individual and the society as a whole, which would make it possible to preserve and strengthen the progressive attainments of world culture, to put them at the service of socialism and, at the same time, to invigorate the quest for new and advanced forms, developing the social creativity of the working masses. By entrenching the achievements of the socialist revolution in the economy, politics and ideology, the cultural revolution creates the necessary prerequisites for an all-round upsurge in the activity of the working people in the most diverse fields of social life, for the spiritual development of each individual and the creative endeavour of the whole people.

All of that is confirmed by the record of the cultural revolu-

tion in the USSR and many other socialist countries. In spite of different historical conditions, cultural transformations in each of these countries have helped to strengthen the gains of the socialist revolution; give the people access to the achievements of world culture; accelerate political, social and other transformations and involve the working masses in running the society; stimulate the scientific and technical creativity of the masses, and promote literature and art; form a new type of individual and create conditions for his all-round development.

Before the revolution, three quarters of the population of tsarist Russia were illiterate. In the course of the cultural revolution in the USSR, illiteracy was totally wiped out. In a relatively short period (by the mid-1930s), the foundations were laid for the broadest and most effective system of school, vocational and higher education. At that time, none of the industrialised Western countries had such a system. In our day, the USSR and other socialist countries have the most developed and democratic system of education, combining all-round theoretical studies with the formation of labour skills and occupational training. More than two-thirds of the Soviet population over 30 years of age have a higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education. The socialist society encourages people (young people above all) in their striving to learn, to assimilate general culture. The state creates conditions for successful education on and off the job, providing students with grants and various allowances, with free housing facilities, libraries, laboratories and special equipment.

Apart from a free choice of occupation, the socialist state also helps every graduate to find a job. School and other graduates under socialism are never left without a job, as it often happens in the capitalist countries. Together with their educational certificates they get a document which guarantees them a job in the line they have chosen. In this way, the young are enabled to make their contribution to the cause of the whole people from their very first independent steps in the realm of labour, to perfect socialism and build a communist society.

The cultural revolution under socialism gave a powerful impulse to the development of the national cultures of numerous nationalities, many of which before the revolution did not even have a written language of their own (in Russia, there were

about 50 such nationalities). The socialist cultural revolution gave them access to the achievements of world civilisation and culture, enabled them to develop education system, literature, science and art. In our day, the USSR's multinational socialist culture encompasses the cultural achievements of all the country's nationalities without exception, both big and small.

The record of socialist transformations in the course of the cultural revolution in different countries shows that cultural renewal is a major factor in accelerating fundamental transformations in various spheres of social life. We have already seen how the cultural revolution in the USSR had a direct and beneficial influence on education, helped to put an end to the age-old national backwardness of the small nationalities, whom tsarism had doomed to ignorance. The cultural revolution entails equally significant changes in the social and other spheres. It helps to accelerate the transformation of the socio-class structure towards ever fuller social homogeneity, since the access to education, science and art given by socialism to all its citizens puts an end to the privileges of some and the rightlessness of other groups and classes in the sphere of culture, characteristic of capitalism. The cultural revolution leads to greater cohesion between the working class, the peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, with the latter drawing new members from among the workers and peasants.

The cultural revolution also has a significant influence on the formation of a new way of life under socialism. As educational standards go up, the people's vital interests and requirements change accordingly. Soviet sociologists have estimated that the Soviet people spend one-half of their spare time on socially meaningful cultural pursuits (reading fiction and scientific literature, attending theatres, museums, exhibitions and concerts, engaging in amateur art). Thus, annual theatre attendance is over 119 million (nearly the whole of the USSR's adult population); the annual figure for concerts is over 160 million, and for museums, over 151 million.

Amateur art is a widespread activity in the USSR. The country has almost 710,000 amateur art collectives, with roughly 19 million members. Over 60 million citizens are members of sports teams and collectives, and even more go in for sports locally (in circles and at playgrounds in their housing areas).

All these are qualitative indicators of the level attained by Soviet culture. The main goal of cultural work under socialism has always been and remains the all-round development of the individual, of all members of the society. Each of these figures is indicative of the new society's constant concern for every individual, for an improvement of working conditions and rest facilities, a rise in material standards, and all-round spiritual development.

Everything in the name of man, for the benefit of man—such is the main goal of the efforts to perfect and develop the culture of mature socialism in the course of the advance to the classless communist society of the future.

So, the cultural successes in the USSR and other countries building a just society clearly refute the anti-Marxist invention about socialism being "hostile" to culture.

Socialism helps to develop in every way all the progressive elements of the cultural legacy left by earlier societies. In developing culture, socialism fills out the achievements of the past with a new historical content, putting them within the reach of every individual.

* * *

Culture is an integral part of people's life in the society, a result of their material production activity and their creative spiritual endeavour.

Marxist theory regards culture as a historically developing phenomenon, connected with a definite level of material and spiritual production within the framework of concrete socio-economic formations.

The social content and value of culture are determined by its spread in every sphere of human activity and life in the society.

The polarisation of culture in antagonistic societies is overcome as a result of the socialist revolution, whose integral part is a cultural revolution.

Socialism creates all the necessary prerequisites for accelerating the development of the cultural creative endeavour of the masses, enabling every individual to assimilate the traditions and achievements of progressive culture.

Chapter Eight

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Morality, science, art and other ideas and forms of social consciousness play an important role in the spiritual life of the society, irrespective of the predominant economic, political and social relations and of the type of culture.

Marxist social theory regards the collective consciousness as an essential factor of the society's life and development. In order to get a correct idea about the society as an integral social organism which exists and develops in accordance with its own, intrinsic laws, it is therefore necessary to understand its collective consciousness, its specifics, structure and role in the society's life.

1. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS: ITS STRUCTURE AND ESSENCE

In the light of the materialist answer to the basic question of philosophy, *social consciousness (collective consciousness) is a reflection of the actually existing diverse conditions of joint human life, of people's collective being.* As Marx and Engels specified in *The German Ideology,* "consciousness [*das Bewusstsein*] can never be anything else than conscious being [*das bewusste Sein*] ... men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their actual world, also their thinking and the products of their thinking. It is not consciousness that determines life, but life that determines consciousness".[1]

Social consciousness reflects people's joint life in the society, their social being with all its aspects and relations. That reflection of being by human cosciousness is an active, creative proc-

[1] Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works,* Vol. 5, pp. 36, 37.

ess. As they come to understand through their consciousness the surrounding reality and the conditions of their social being, people set themselves diverse practical tasks aimed at changing these conditions and transforming the society, and then realise these tasks. In this way, through their consciousness and activity people exert an active influence on social development.

The close connection between people's social being and their collective consciousness is dialectical. The dialectics of being and consciousness manifests itself in every sphere of human life, starting from the production of material values and the relations into which people enter in that process and ending with the spheres of social consciousness itself.

Whereas social being in the precise sense of the word is the society's production and economic activity (whose material vehicle are the productive forces and the economic basis, which ultimately determine all the other types and forms of human activity in the society), social consciousness is the totality of all the forms and aspects of spiritual life in the society. Social being is the main object directly reflected by social consciousness. And, just as the society itself cannot be reduced to a sum total of the individuals living in it, social consciousness, which reflects their joint being, is not a mere aggregation of the views, ideas and notions of each of them. It is a complex and independent multi-level formation, which has its own structure, and which changes and develops according to its own laws.

Non-Marxist philosophy and sociology, which absolutise the role of consciousness in social life, often confine their interpretations of the collective consciousness to the sphere of the functioning of individuals' views and ideas. From these positions, existentialist and phenomenological sociology, and interactionism interpret social consciousness solely as the result of a "dialectical interplay" of individual consciousnesses, which provides a basis for the "social construction" of reality, i.e., for a definite picture of the society, a set of notions about it, which are fixed in the consciousness of its members, being variously shared and supported by them.[1] Such an approach in effect equates social

[1] See, for instance, Peter L. Berger, Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality. Theatise in Sociology of Knowledge*, Penguin Books, London, 1971, Chapter 1.

being and the collective consciousness that reflects it, since social reality is presented as a result of the activity of individual consciousnesses. And that is a fundamental mistake.

The faultiness of such a stand was shown by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* in which he demonstrated that in all circumstances "consciousness is only the reflection of being".[1]

So what is social consciousness? What are its main forms? Let us try to answer each of these questions.

As a relatively independent, integral formation, social consciousness includes all the ideas, views, theories, habits, customs and social feelings which reflect various aspects of people's collective life. The diverse conditions of their life in the society, the complex and often contradictory patterns of social reality are reflected in social consciousness. It includes the most diverse views and notions (political, ethical, scientific, religious, philosophical, aesthetic, etc.), both existing on the basis of individual and everyday consciousness, collective psychology, and of various theoretical views fixed in ideology.

Individual consciousness is one of the direct sources of social consciousness. As a mobile totality of the interests, thoughts, views and moods of particular individuals, individual consciousness reflects the complex interaction between the social environment, the society in which they live, and their immediate surrounding, or micro-environment.

The individual's self-consciousness—an awareness of oneself, of one's place in the world, and one's attitude to the society, class and group with which one is connected—is a major part of individual consciousness.

Individual and social consciousness are closely interconnected. That interconnection reflects the dialectical unity of the particular (individual consciousness) and the general (collective consciousness).

Under the influence of the immediate conditions of joint human life, and on the basis of the views, habits, feelings and notions of various groups, classes and nations there emerges a special form of social consciousness: collective (social) psychology.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 14, 1977, p. 326.

Consciousness at that stage is still largely spontaneous, although even at that level a group, class or nation can have an awareness of its interests and express these in the form of definite feelings, illusions and moods (such as individualistic inclinations of the petty bourgeoisie; the sense of collectivism and cohesion in the working class, which rallies it to fight against the exploiters; and so on).

At the level of social psychology, the consciousness of a class does not as yet rise to theoretically grounded notions about its place and role in the society. The formation of the working class, for instance, included its evolvement from a class "in itself", when its feelings of hatred for the bourgeoisie induced it to rise up in struggle against the latter for its economic interests, into a class "for itself", with a growing class consciousness, organisation, and assimilation of the ideas of scientific socialism, of the socialist ideology. At that stage of development, the working class already realises its role and its historic mission.

Together with everyday consciousness (people's everyday empirical notions about themselves and the surrounding world), social psychology is one of the sources of ideology, which is a system of theoretical views, ideas and convictions of a definite class (political, legal, ethical, religious, aesthetic, etc.). Through ideology, the realities of the social being of a given class and the society as a whole find a systematic, theoretical reflection in the collective consciousness. The ideology of a class entrenches and crystallises the views of that class, serving as a guide for its activity in the surrounding world. Distinctions between class ideologies stem from the objective distinctions in the status of classes in the society, from their differing vital interests. That is reflected in a specific way in the ideological struggle, which permeates different aspects of life in an antagonistic-class society, including the sphere of social consciousness.

So, the source of the ideas, views and theories that form social consciousness lies in social being itself, in the unity of its diverse aspects. Social consciousness is the whole spiritual life of the society, all its levels and forms taken together. It includes the consciousness of individuals, groups and classes, their feelings, moods, various forms of rational consciousness (including natural, technical and social sciences), collective psychology and ideology. The main forms of social consciousness include politi-

cal consciousness, legal consciousness, morality, science, art, philosophy and religion.

Each of these relatively independent forms of social consciousness is connected in its own way with social being, with its diverse aspects, and has its specific features. At the same time, there is a general, fundamental law which determines the nature of that connection.

Any form of social consciousness reflects social being and is secondary with regard to that being. In other words, social being is primary with regard to social consciousness and fully determines it.

That law helps to understand the specifics, place and significance of social consciousness in human life: it is not human consciousness that "forms" the society and determines the course of its development but, on the contrary, social being and people's material production activity that engender their views, ideas and theories. Mankind's history has often shown how changes in the sphere of material production entailed changes in the society's spiritual life, as some ideas, views and notions gave way to more progressive ones.

2. INDEPENDENCE OF SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS. ITS ROLE IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The law which determines the role of social being with regard to social consciousness, discovered by Marx and Engels, enabled them to see social consciousness as a relatively independent phenomenon, which cannot be reduced to a direct dependence on the conditions of human material production activity. The critics of Marxism accused it of an attempt to reduce the whole diversity of social processes, including those of social consciousness, to economic laws, in order to avoid examining the specifics of social processes. But Marxism has never claimed a direct, automatic dependence of social consciousness on the conditions of social being. The urge to postulate such a dependence was solely characteristic of those who vulgarised the key propositions of the Marxist theory. In our day, it is a feature of so-called "neo-Marxism", many of whose representatives share the views of vulgar sociology, insisting on direct connections and a direct correspondence between the processes unfolding in the basis (eco-

nomic contradictions) and in the superstructure of the present-day capitalist society (contradictions in ideology, art, etc.).

A striving to detect direct analogies between economic structures and the changes in the sphere of social consciousness is often manifested by Western sociologists of literature and fine arts, which leads them to conclusions that have nothing in common with the Marxist understanding of the specifics of spiritual life. The sociology of art studies the social nature of the relations between art as a reflection of social being and the society itself. That can adequately be done solely on the basis of Marxist dialectics, which makes it possible to see the correlation between the various aspects of the phenomenon being studied. A different approach to the analysis of these relations is displayed by researchers who are influenced by the conceptions of Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, and especially Lucien Goldmann's "genetic structuralism", trying to see the structure and language of works of literature and fine arts as a direct reflection of the social relations existing in the sphere of material production under capitalism. The attempts to trace such direct dependences distort the true mechanisms of social reflection.

Social consciousness is relatively independent, for in its development it can either lag behind or outpace social being, and is an active force that influences changes in the latter.

Human consciousness can lag behind the changes in the conditions of joint human life because of the tenacity of old views and ideas. Under capitalism, these are objectively preserved by the mass media (the press, radio and television), which are an instrument in the hands of the propertied classes.

But even with the establishment of a new social system as a result of revolution, that is, with a radical change in the conditions of social being, human consciousness does not change automatically and can retain diverse survivals of the past, obsolete views, etc.

At the same time, social consciousness can outpace social development. Here are two examples. First, an analysis of the tendencies of social development under capitalism enabled Marx, Engels and Lenin to formulate and substantiate a theoretical forecast which is being confirmed decades later by the main lines of mankind's advance towards socialism and communism. And second, in the conditions of economically backward coun-

tries (as in 19th-century Germany or Russia) some progressive works of literature and art far outpaced social development, for they expressed a progressive social ideal.

The relative independence of social consciousness also manifests itself in the *continuity* of the development of ideology. The class that wins in a revolution does not discard the achievements of the spiritual culture of the past, but puts them at the service of the new social system. From the ideological heritage and the culture of the past, each class takes that which can serve its interests. Reactionary classes cling to obsolete ideals and try to impose them on the society in which they are still in power, whereas progressive classes assimilate the best achievements of spiritual culture and put these at the service of the society as a whole.

So, social consciousness plays an active role in the society's life and development. Acting in a conscious way, people exert a great influence on social life by their ideas, views and theories. Social consciousness also performs an active role in social life because it brings people together, directs them in the solution of various problems, and is a mobilising factor in their social activity. A major point to emphasise is that the role of ideas in social life depends on the class which has generated these ideas, on how they reflect the realities of the given society and the interests of the people. Progressive ideas, if they express the fundamental interests of the toiling classes, can have a decisive effect on the whole course of social development (but only if these ideas can be assimilated by the popular masses). Such ideas in our day are the ideas of the fairest society—socialism and communism—theoretically substantiated and developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin. These ideas are now being translated into practice in the USSR and other socialist community countries, and also in quite a number of developing Asian, African and Latin American countries that are following the road of socialist construction.

Social consciousness can also manifest itself through a negative, hindering influence on social development. Such a negative influence is exerted, in particular, by the reactionary ideas and theories being spread by the ruling classes of the capitalist society. These ideas and theories distort reality and thus serve to divert the masses and their allies from a consistent struggle for

progressive social transformations. A major role is also played by religious ideas and views, which on the whole have a similar effect on human minds.

Consequently, social consciousness is one of the crucial factors influencing the society's life and the course of its progressive development.

3. THE FORMS OF SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The diversity of the forms of social consciousness derives from the diversity of the spheres of human life in the society. Political, legal, ethical, religious, aesthetic, scientific and philosophical consciousness reflects objective social reality from its own, special angle. But the influence of each of these forms on social consciousness as a whole goes beyond the sphere of its functioning. There is a close interaction and cross-influence between the various forms of social consciousness, something that is due, in particular, to their structure.

The structure of each of these forms includes spiritual entities on two levels. The first of these is connected with the functioning of ideas, views, notions, etc., on the level of social psychology, and the second, on the level of ideology. The proportions between these two levels differ markedly from one form of social consciousness to another. In philosophy, for instance, the ideological layer is more significant than the socio-psychological one, whereas in the sphere of art (aesthetic consciousness), there is an opposite picture. The correlation between the two constituent structural levels—socio-psychological and ideological—in each form of social consciousness affects the specifics of the reflection of reality by these forms.

At the same time, all of them are components of the society's superstructure, so that the essence, content, nature and place of each of these forms are ultimately determined by the specifics of the society's economic basis. Differing from the rest in subject-matter and content, each of these forms deals with "its own" layer of social being. The main distinction between these forms lies in the mode in which they reflect collective being: juridical law in the legal sphere, theoretical abstraction in science, artistic image in literature and art, etc.

To understand the specifics of these distinctions, let us take a closer look at each of the forms of social consciousness.

Political consciousness. As Marx and Engels analysed in *The German Ideology* the question of the relative independence of social consciousness, they showed the social nature of the division of labour into material and spiritual and established a deepening differentiation of the latter, its conversion into a monopoly of the ruling class, in whose interests its ideologues develop pure theory, philosophy, theology, morality, etc.

Political consciousness reflects the interests of definite social classes in the form of their political views, moods, ideas, and so on. *Political consciousness is a totality of the views, illusions, ideas and theories of different classes reflecting their attitude to state power, to the activity of parties, classes, nations and states.*

In a class society, the political consciousness of each class is closely tied in with its economic status. Directly reflecting and expressing the economic interests of a given class, conditioned by its social status, political consciousness determines the tasks and goals of its struggle to realise these interests.

Political consciousness functions on two planes: first, as a manifestation of the psychology of a class (i.e., in the form of social consciousness which takes shape spontaneously among its members under the direct impact of the conditions of their social being); and second, as a political ideology specially elaborated by the ideologues of the given class.

The political ideology of a class is a systematised theoretical expression of its views on the political organisation of the society, the forms of state, the relations between diverse social groups and classes within its framework, their place in the society's life, and the relations of the given state with other states. These views are recorded in the documents adopted by the state, the various parties and public organisations (slogans, programmes, declarations, constitutions and manifestoes). In their activity, they are guided by the theoretical propositions and conclusions written into these documents, advocate and seek to implement them.

The character of the political slogans, ideas, doctrines and theories constituting the political ideology of a class is determined by its economic and social interests.

The predominant exploiter classes of antagonistic societies, which are interested in perpetuating the relations of economic

inequality and oppression, use outwardly democratic slogans to spread a reactionary political ideology which justifies their privileged status and their striving for economic expansion and political domination over other, as well as their own, peoples. The political theories and doctrines of the ruling circles of the imperialist states are a concrete expression of such interests. That largely explains the profound and chronic crisis of the political thought of present-day capitalism and of its policy, which cuts across the vital aspirations of the people, of the working masses.

The political ideology of imperialism in our day is contrasted with socialist ideology, which expresses the basic interests of the toiling classes, including the interests of the classes that are subjected to exploitation under capitalism.

An irreconcilable struggle is under way between these two political ideologies. Expressing the interests of all the working people, the political ideology of socialism asserts and exercises the principles of proletarian internationalism, friendship and cooperation between peoples, solidarity of all the progressive forces in the struggle to maintain and strengthen peace and to remove the threat of a nuclear war posed by imperialist policy.

The political ideas of the working class and the policy of socialist states are based on a scientific, Marxist-Leninist understanding of the laws and motive forces of social development and fully accord with the vital interests of the peoples of all countries, regardless of any economic, socio-political, historical and other distinctions between them. That explains the appeal of socialist foreign policy, the active support extended to it by all those who cherish peace, democracy and socialism. Since they meet the interests of all the working people, political ideas under socialism, just as the policy of socialist states, exert an immense positive influence on all aspects of social life, help to perfect them, and promote a rapid and purposeful development of the economy and culture, and an improvement of the people's wellbeing.

Legal consciousness. Political relations are closely connected with legal relations, which are regulated by law and are controlled by legal consciousness.

Law is the totality of juridical norms (laws) which are binding for all members of the society. Observance of these norms, which

provide a basis for a legal order (law and order) corresponding to the interests of the predominant class, is ensured by the state.

The legal relations of a given society are reflected in its legal consciousness and the predominant legal ideology. As a class phenomenon, *legal consciousness includes the views and notions of a given class which express its attitude to law and order, and also its assessment of diverse phenomena in the society's life from the standpoint of the existing system of justice and legislation.*

Just as political consciousness, legal consciousness exists on two levels: psychological (in the form of notions about what is lawful and unlawful) and ideological (in the form of theoretical constructions).

A systematic theoretical expression of the legal consciousness of a class is its *legal ideology,* which concentrates its views on the nature and purpose of legal relations, norms and institutions, on matters of legislation, the powers of the courts and the procurator's office, etc., in order to defend or assert the legal order that meets the interests of that class.

Just as any other form of theoretical knowledge, legal ideology in any society is historically transient. It takes shape in a class society as a means of entrenching the economic rule of some classes over others on the basis of legal norms and enactments. Legal consciousness and legal ideology thus not only reflect, but also consolidate the predominant economic relations in the society.

Under capitalism, as in any other society divided into antagonistic classes, the predominant legal ideas are those of the exploiter class, which uses them to impose its will on the other classes. The legal consciousness of that society is extremely heterogeneous. Alongside general human content (denunciation of violence, robbery, personal abuse, etc.), it contains the clashing legal consciousnesses of the most diverse classes. While advocating equality and justice, the bourgeoisie also seeks to camouflage its predominant position with the help of diverse theories substantiating the supra-class nature of legal enactments. As for the classes and groups that are economically and politically dependent on the bourgeoisie, these develop their own legal con-

sciousness, their own views on laws and relations between people, classes, nations and states.

Under socialism, on the contrary, legal consciousness is highly homogeneous, for it expresses and serves the interests of the whole people, so exerting a most beneficial influence on the life of the society (helping to root out survivals of the past, to raise the working people's consciousness and creative activity).

Moral consciousness. Morality plays a major role alongside law in regulating human behaviour in the society.

Morality is a special form of social consciousness comprising all the norms, feelings and notions by which people are guided in their mutual relations, both in their personal and social life.

The specifics of the reflection of reality by that form of social consciousness is evident from such categories as good and evil, duty, justice, dignity, happiness, and so on. Each of these categories reflects definite moral feelings and notions that exist both in the everyday (conventional) moral consciousness of the society as a whole and in the theoretical constructions of moral ideology, or ethics, which entrench the moral values of definite social classes and groups.

Moral notions exist and are sustained by the force of habit, public opinion, traditions and customs. At the same time, the effectiveness of moral norms, values and ideals depends on the individual's inner motivations.

Moral consciousness plays an exceptionally important role in regulating human behaviour in the society. Morality regulates human behaviour in all spheres of social life without exception. But its effectiveness differs from one sphere to another. That is why in any of these—the sphere of everyday life, labour, family relations, etc.—unwritten moral norms which are not enshrined in any normative documents are supplemented with other regulators of behaviour (juridical laws, organisational rules, instructions, administrative orders, official directions, and so on). Moral regulation of human behaviour is thus closely tied in with the influence on that behaviour of social norms operating in other spheres of people's life and activity (economics, politics, law, etc.). At the same time, the moral content of human behaviour is not derived from these norms and is not connected with these in any way, but is determined solely by socially controlled moral requirements—by people's moral consciousness and

self-consciousness, which includes convictions, feelings and conscience.

As a historical entity, morality is closely connected with social development. In a society divided into antagonistic classes, there can never be one and the same morality for all classes. Alongside the morality of the ruling classes there is a morality of the deprived and oppressed classes. The struggle between these classes in the antagonistic society also runs through their moral consciousness and is reflected in a clash of the moral ideals and convictions of people belonging to different classes, in moral conflicts which permeate the spiritual life of the society. It is only under socialism, with the elimination of class antagonisms that the necessary prerequisites arise for a coherent morality of the toiling classes, for an assertion of the principles of communist morality, which regards man as the supreme value and establishes new relations between people, based on mutual assistance, respect, collectivism and comradeship, on each individual's high consciousness and a sense of patriotic, labour and moral duty to the society.

In our day, morality has an active influence on all spheres of social life without exception (from the economy, where people's attitudes to their labour determine its results, to politics, ideology, and so on), in which moral judgements (approval or condemnation) of human activity often determine its direction.

Religion. In contrast to other forms of social consciousness, religion is a false, distorted reflection of being in human consciousness. "All religion," Engels wrote, "is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their daily life, a reflection in which the terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces."[1]

Religion exists in the form of the *everyday religious consciousness* (which includes religious notions, feelings and illusions which reaffirm one's faith in the supernatural—the other world, gods, their ability to work miracles), and *religious ideology,* which is a product of the theoretical substantiation and systematisation of these illusory views and ideas about the world.

Religion is primarily faith in the supernatural. It is the false notions connected with such faith that give a specific, religious

[1] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring,* p. 374.

tinge to people's emotional and mental attitude to the surrounding reality. That attitude is strengthened by religious feelings, rites and ceremonies (prayers, offerings, etc.).

Religion as a form of social consciousness includes religious notions, feelings and acts. The content of these components changes together with the conditions of religious practice, which depend on the conditions of life in the society and its development. Religion is a historically transient phenomenon.

Art. This form of social consciousness *reflects reality in artistic images.* Art reflects reality, with all its properties and qualities, helping people to get a deeper understanding of the world. As a means of artistic cognition and evaluation of reality, art is a powerful instrument of moral, political and artistic education.

The multiform properties, aspects and phenomena of reality, which are the subject-matter of art, and the diverse modes of their artistic reflection determine the various types of art: literature, architecture, sculpture, opera, ballet, painting, music, cinema, and so on. There are many different genres of art, within which one can trace the development of separate schools, trends, styles and creative manners of the artistic comprehension of life. A refraction of life through the prism of individual human feelings, aspirations and interests characterises the image-bearing artistic reflection which brings out the general and essential features of reality.

It is precisely by portraying the unique and inimitable specifics of life, which art shows by typifying it in its artistic images, that it attracts people, irrespective of age, moral convictions or social status.

The emergence and development of art is closely connected with human labour activity. In producing material values, man not only transformed the world, but also transformed his own self, developing and perfecting his creative abilities. With the growing division of labour, the connection between production and diverse types of art became ever more complicated. That connection of art with man's material, production activity still remains in our day, although in mediated form.

As a form of social consciousness, art has a complex structure which includes these components: aesthetic feelings, perception and taste, aesthetic views and notions; aesthetic theories

which substantiate definite socially meaningful ideals of art, its tasks and purposes.

Art does not exist on its own, but performs certain functions in the life of the society. The most important of these is its *ideological and cognitive function,* for art does not simply reflect or copy life, but seeks to explain it, to bring out and evaluate the content of processes unfolding in reality. In arousing people's emotions, it also arouses their thoughts, generates new ideas and casts a new slant on "conventional", habitual things. In that way, art invigorates man's creative spirit, his consciousness and self-consciousness.

That is why art is always social, concrete and partisan. In a class society, it has a class character. There can never be any "pure" art, or "art for art's sake". All the attempts to create an art of that kind have merely demonstrated the striving of the reactionary classes to make art serve their own interests, connected with a suppression of progressive elements in the ideology and culture of their society.

In a class society, art is a vehicle not only of moral, but also of political ideas. History shows that advanced, progressive and perfect art, which advocates lofty human ideals, always outlives its epoch, its class and its creator, and becomes an asset of world culture. Continuity in the development of art means that, as it develops from one epoch to another, it retains and passes on all the best and valuable of its achievements.

Truly realistic, progressive art is always rooted in the people and is connected with the people's life. The achievements of world literature, music, painting, etc., preserve the national artistic experience of the people that fostered their creators, and carry it to other peoples, helping to bring together and promoting mutual understanding between individuals, cultures and epochs.

Science. This form of social consciousness is a *system of man's knowledge about the surrounding world —nature, the society and thought.*

As compared with art, which is characterised by artistic, personally specific methods of typifying the experience of cognition, science reflects the world in "depersonalised", abstract concepts, categories and laws, whose validity can only be tested in practice.

In its development, science keeps differentiating and deepen-

ing its knowledge. That is why it exists in the form of numerous particular scientific disciplines, each of which studies a definite sphere of reality (its subject-matter). There is also a narrower division of labour among researchers within a single discipline, diverse schools, trends, and so on.

All the sciences are now divided into social (philosophy, sociology, economic, historical and other sciences) and natural (mathematical, physical, biological and other sciences). Numerous applied technical sciences, which service the purely practical needs of technology and industrial production, are adjacent to the fundamental natural disciplines.

The development of science in our day is marked both by its differentiation and its integration: a synthesis of the experience of diverse sciences and the emergence of new scientific disciplines (like biological mechanics or cybernetics). Many significant discoveries are now being made at the junction of different sciences, especially in areas of natural science where biologists, physicists, mathematicians, chemists and geneticists carry on joint research. Progress in the natural sciences makes it possible to give a totally new explanation to many phenomena, and that new knowledge helps to expand man's practical influence on nature.

Having stemmed from practical human requirements, science develops with a view to the social importance of these requirements. It has a particularly strong impact on the society in the conditions of the ongoing scientific and technical revolution, when successes in automation, power engineering, electronics, biotechnology and cybernetics radically alter the earlier conceptions of production processes. Science also changes the nature of labour, which is increasingly automated and filled out with intellectual content. And that makes it necessary to restructure the whole system of training and use of specialists in the economy. In this way, the development of the productive forces necessitates a steady perfection of the relations of production.

The social consequences of the STR under capitalism, however, often turn against the working people, because while opening up new possibilities for optimising production, successes in science often lead to greater unemployment, higher prices, and more intensive exploitation of labour. And that is only natural

in a society where science and technology serve the interests of those who own the means of production, the interests of the capitalist class, which gears the course of scientific and technical progress to commercial considerations based on a striving to derive maximum profits. That is why science itself is increasingly commercialised. Its development is totally subordinated to the self-seeking interests of the monopolies, which markedly reduces its social potential.

The relations between science and the society are quite different under socialism, where it is a powerful instrument for accelerating production and improving the wellbeing of all the working people. A conjunction of the basic achievements of the STR with the advantages of the socialist economic system in our day opens up boundless perspectives for a qualitative improvement of the working people's life.

Under socialism, science serves the people. The huge army of scientists and research personnel come from the people, and they use their professional knowledge for the people's benefit. There are no longer any social barriers between scientific creative endeavour and other types of work and production activity, as there are under capitalism. In the USSR, it is not only scientists who make their contribution to the country's scientific potential, but also millions of innovators, inventors and researchers in production—enthusiasts who combine work at plants and factories, on collective farms, in the most diverse sectors of the economy with an active scientific quest.

Socialism creates all the conditions for raising the efficiency of science. Scientific research is coordinated both on the scale of separate economic regions and on the scale of whole countries and the socialist community as a whole.

The dialectico-materialist world outlook, which is the theoretico-cognitive guide and methodology of science under socialism, equips researchers with a correct understanding of the phenomena and processes they study. It is owing to the successes of science that this world outlook has been accepted by all members of the socialist society.

In the USSR, as in other socialist countries, constant attention is being paid to the development of science, for modern science is turning into a powerful productive force. Skillful use of its results under socialism helps to restructure the whole national

economic mechanism and to switch it to intensive development, which creates the necessary prerequisites and conditions for a rapid improvement of the material wellbeing of all social groups and strata, for the society's advance along the road of improving socialism, towards communism.

* * *

In examining and bringing out the laws of the functioning of ideas in the society and its spiritual culture as a whole, Marxist social theory gives a scientific explanation of the specific mechanism and diversity of each form of social consciousness. That helps to understand many processes of present-day ideological and cultural life.

Each form of social consciousness Marxism examines: (a) in connection with its other forms and (b) on the assumption of the structural unity of its basic levels and components.

Marxist social theory shows the dialectics of the society and the process of its reflection by each form of collective consciousness, making it possible to see the influence of that process on human life in the society and its development.

Conclusion

This study aid was meant to acquaint the reader with the principles of Marxist social theory and the range of its problems.

As an introduction to historical materialism, this book naturally does not lay claim to an exhaustive analysis of all its problems. That is hardly possible, and not only in view of the specifics of the philosophical and sociological problems considered by historical materialism, but also because this book, like any other "introduction", is only a preliminary step to the subsequent study of the multifaceted historical process and the human society.

The scientific materialist conception of social theory was developed in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin precisely as a philosophico-sociological theory of history and the society. This theory serves as a guide in the scientific analysis of the problems of man and of the laws and conditions of transforming the world in which he lives.

The development of historical materialism was closely tied in with the elaboration by its founders of the principles of dialectico-materialist philosophy, which opened a new stage in the development of human cognition as a whole, including social cognition. That process was successful primarily because its theorists were able to draw close to an adequate vision of the major problems of the society and social cognition. It was only the principles of scientific dialectical philosophy that made it possible to re-orient social knowledge along radically new lines.

Marx, Engels and Lenin did not confine themselves to a quest for ways of solving the theoretical problems of social science, but linked up these problems with the urgent practical aspects of social reconstruction. That is why one could say that right

from the very beginning Marxist philosophico-sociological theory developed in answer to mankind's vital questions, as formulated by progressive scientific thought.

Socio-historical development in the 20th century has fully confirmed the truth, scientific validity and consistency of the stand taken by historical materialism on cardinal issues of history, the society and social cognition itself.

The present-day picture of the changes that reflect the course of mankind's advance along the road of social progress is highly complicated and contradictory. The contest between the forces of progress and reaction in our day is extremely intense and irreconcilable.

These clashing tendencies exert a considerable influence on economics and politics, ideology and culture, morality, science, art, and every other sphere of human life in the present-day world. One can hardly be indifferent to such burning problems as those of peace, disarmament and realisation of elementary human rights, implying the need to guarantee human life and ensure a dignified future for mankind, a future without war or poverty, exploitation or humiliation, hunger or violence.

Historical materialism gives a scientific explanation of existing problems, helps to understand their underlying causes, and points out ways to resolve them.

Just as historical and social reality itself, scientific materialist theory is steadily developing: some of its propositions are being specified, and the principles of social cognition outlined and elaborated by Marx, Engels and Lenin are being reaffirmed and deepened.

To master these principles and the related categories, it is not enough to go through a manual in historical materialism, however full and detailed. One should keep turning to the prime sources of that doctrine—the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The struggle carried on by the founders of the new and scientific materialist theory against any misconceptions of social life and the sources of its change is still relevant today.

This book marks the first step in the acquaintance with the genesis and problems of historical materialism. But there is no end to the development of human cognition, and one should like to hope that the reader will continue along that way, deepening and perfecting his or her knowledge.

Glossary: Key Concepts of Marxist Philosophy and Social Theory*

A

Activity, a specifically human active attitude to the surrounding world, whose content is the transformation of the latter.

Agnosticism, a philosophical conception that denies the possibility of knowing the laws and essence of the objective world.

Alienation, a conversion of the results of human activity (products of labour, social and other relations), of man's properties and abilities into something independent of him, alien to him and dominating over him. A. is a historically transient phenomenon in social development, conditioned by the character of the division of labour in a society dominated by private property.

Anarchism, a petty-bourgeois socio-political trend that denies all political (and other) authority and indicates individualism, boundless freedom of the individual.

Antagonistic Society, a society divided into classes with opposite, or antagonistic, interests.

Anthropologism, a philosophical trend which sees the concept of "man" (rather than "matter" or "consciousness") as the main category of the world outlook, on the strength of which one can elaborate one's view of nature, the society and thought. A. is confined to an abstract understanding of man and implies idealism in views on the society.

Aristocracy, (1) the top stratum of the exploiter classes, a privileged hereditary nobility in the slaveholding, feudal and capitalist society; 2) a type of government characterised by the rule of an aristocratic elite.

Art, a specific type of man's spiritual and practical mastery of the world, creative activity in the course of which man creates artistic images that reflect reality and embody his aesthetic attitude to it. As a form of social consciousness, A. not only reflects, but exerts an active influence on practical human life, and has a moral, educational and political significance.

B

Basis, the totality of historically conditioned relations of production, which constitute the society's economic structure and above which rises its superstructure.

Bell, Daniel (b. 1919), American bourgeois sociologist, the leading theorist of the post-industrial society.

* The terms are referred to in the text by the initial letter or letters.

Blagoyev, Dimitr (1856-1924), propagandist of Marxism in Bulgaria and Russia, author of works in Marxist philosophy.

Blanquism, a trend in the French revolutionary movement of the 19th century connected with the name of Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881), who believed that it was possible to put an end to capitalism through a seizure of power by a handful of revolutionaries. Denying the importance of the proletariat's class struggle, Blanqui absolutised conspiratorial tactics in the event of an uprising (and so depreciated the role of the party and the masses).

Bourgeois Democracy, a form of power in a bourgeois state under which the equality of all citizens (political and other rights and freedoms) is proclaimed only nominally, whereas the actual purpose is to ensure the interests and privileges of the ruling classes, to maintain their high social status enshrined by that power.

Bourgeoisie, a class which owns the means of production and exploits wage-labour; the ruling class of the capitalist society, which includes big, medium and small capitalists. The predominant positions within the bourgeois class are occupied by the representatives of big (including monopoly) capital, who seek to perpetuate their domination.

C

Capitalism, a socio-economic system based on private property in the means of production and exploitation of wage-labour by capital.

Categories (in philosophy), the most general concepts that reflect both the main properties and uniformities of objective reality itself and the connection between it and cognition (in this instance, C. determine the character of theoretical thought). Among the most fundamental philosophical C. are being, consciousness, matter, motion, etc.

Civic Society, a term of pre-Marxist philosophy used to denote the bourgeois society (or, more precisely, the property relations of that society).

Class Antagonism, a confrontation of mutually antithetical class interests stemming from the peculiarities of the social and economic status of each of these classes.

Class "for Itself", a concept characterising the objective and subjective revelation of the essence of a class in the historical process (see *Class "in Itself".*) A class "for itself" is a stage in the development of a class when, having understood its own interests, it puts them forward in definite political programmes, contrasts them with the interests of other classes, and carries on an active struggle for their realisation. The development of a class "in itself" into a class "for itself" depends on the formation and maturing of its class consciousness.

Class "in Itself", a stage in the development of a class which is not as yet aware of its basic vital interests, of their distinction from (or coincidence with) the interests of other classes, and which has not as yet come up with any political or social programmes of its own (see *Class "for Itself").*

Class Struggle, an economic, political and ideological struggle be-

tween classes whose vital interests, their material interests above all, are incompatible. C. S. leads to a resolution of class contradictions, and is the motive force behind the development of antagonistic societies and a prerequisite for a transition from one socio-economic formation to another (through revolution, the culminating point of the class struggle).

Classes, Basic, classes connected with the predominant mode of production. In an antagonistic-class society, these include the class which owns the means of production and the opposite oppressed class (slaves and slave-owners in a slaveholding society; peasants and landowners under feudalism; the proletariat and the bourgeoisie under capitalism).

Classes, Non-Basic, classes in an antagonistic society which have no direct connection with the predominant mode of production (like handicraftsmen under slavery or peasants under capitalism); to these classes are adjacent various social strata (the clergy, the intelligentsia), which, like these classes themselves, often back the interests and positions of one of the basic classes, so influencing the course of the class struggle.

Classical German Philosophy, the philosophical systems of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Feuerbach, which represented a major historical period in the development of philosophy, a period marked by the emergence of the dialectical method, eventually reworked on a materialist basis by Marx and Engels.

Clericalism, a socio-political trend seeking to strengthen the role of the Church in the spiritual and political life of the society. C. is used by the imperialist circles in the struggle against progressive mass movements.

Cognition, a socio-historical process of human activity aimed at reflecting the objective world in human consciousness; the results of C. exist in the form of knowledge.

Collective Farmers, a class employed in agricultural production based on group (collective-farm-cooperative) property.

Collectivism, a moral principle which expresses relations of mutual assistance, solidarity and cooperation between people. As a principle, C. is antithetical to individualism.

Colonialism, political, economic and spiritual enslavement of countries which are usually less developed in socio-economic terms.

Common Sense, people's views on the surrounding reality and on themselves which take shape spontaneously, under the impact of their daily experience. C. S. provides a basis for human practical activity and morality.

Comte, Auguste (1798-1857), French bourgeois philosopher and sociologist, founder of positivism.

Concept (scientific), man's generalised idea about the features and properties of objects or phenomena expressed in terms of language (in the form of words or combinations of words). By bringing out the general and essential in objects and phenomena (like "revolution" or "dictatorship of the proletariat"), C. is an instrument of theoretical cognition.

Consciousness, human capacity for an ideal reproduction of reality in thought. C. is conscious being, a property of highly organised mat-

ter, a subjective image of the objective world. As a form of mental reflection, C. is a result of social practice.

Cosmopolitanism, a reactionary bourgeois ideology advocating indifference to one's homeland, people and national culture. Bourgeois C. is antithetical and hostile to proletarian internationalism.

Counterculture, an ideology of protest against the bourgeois establishment on the part of social groups and strata in the West opposed to the predominant culture. C. is a form of spontaneous petty-bourgeois protest against "mass culture" and technocratic ideology.

Cultural Norms, historically changing (though relatively stable) models and standards rooted in customs and traditions, which provide a basis for regulating the activity of the society as a whole, its cultural institutions and systems.

Culture, all types of transformative activity by man and the society, and also its results. C. is a historical level in the development of man and the society expressed in definite forms and types of the organisation of human life and activity, in the material and spiritual values created by people.

Culture of Human Relations, a system of values, rules, modes and models of human thought and action, which manifests itself in the character of the relations between individuals and the types of behaviour accepted in a given society.

Custom, a habitual mode of behaviour common to most members of the society (social group).

D

Democracy, people's power, a political system which proclaims and enacts in law the citizens' freedoms and equality. Bourgeois democracy is marked by a discrepancy between the nominally proclaimed power of the people and the actual rule of a minority, the bourgeoisie. Socialism establishes people's power in practice, with true democracy for all the working people; laws under socialism not only establish, but also guarantee the freedoms and equality of all citizens.

Detente, a policy of relations between states with different social systems aimed at strengthening peaceful coexistence between them, mutual confidence, mutual understanding and cooperation in the economic, humanitarian and other fields on the basis of a negotiated settlement of complicated international problems without any use of force, military or political pressure.

Dialectical Materialism, a science of the most general laws governing the development of nature, the society and thought, the philosophical world outlook of Marxism-Leninism, the general methodology of the cognition and transformation of the world.

Dialectics, a philosophical doctrine of the most general laws governing the development of nature, the society and thought, the universal method of the cognition of reality.

Dictatorship, (1) the political rule of a definite class; (2) the power of a dictator.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat, state power of the working class es-

tablished through a socialist revolution and used to assert the victory of that revolution, ensure broad democracy for the working people, suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiter classes, and build a socialist society in the conditions of a period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Coercion of the exploiters is not the sole or even the main purpose of D. P., which is mostly meant to tackle constructive tasks: to build a socialist social system and put into effect the fullest democracy for all the working people. The diversity of the historical forms of D. P. is due to differences in the conditions of building socialism.

Division of Labour, a socially conditioned system of interconnected, but different types and forms of labour activity, specific to each particular epoch.

Doctrine, a system of views expressing definite ideological or political tenets (like the Monroe D., which justifies US hegemony in the Western Hemisphere, or the D. of globalism, which serves to establish US imperialist diktat in different regions of the world).

E

Economic System of the Society, the system of economic life in a country reflecting the nature and forms of property, the goals of social production, and the principles of the distribution of the social product and economic administration. Any economic system is based on a historically conditioned type of property in the means of production.

Economism, an opportunist trend in the Russian Social-Democratic movement in the early 20th century, which sought to confine the working-class movement solely to a struggle for economic interests.

Elite, a concept of non-Marxist sociology denoting "select", privileged groups of people who play the "leading", active role in social life. The concept implies an apologetics of the actual relations of socio-economic, class inequality.

Empirio-Criticism, a subjective-idealist trend in philosophy (late 19th and early 20th centuries) connected with the doctrine of Ernst Mach and other philosophers of a "critical experience" of the world as a "complex of sensations" E. C. denied the actual existence of the material world and regarded things as phenomena of the consciousness, as complexes of human sensations. In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1908), Lenin refuted E. C.'s idealistic interpretation of questions relating to cognition.

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895), a brilliant theorist and great proletarian revolutionary, one of the founders of Marxism as the new revolutionary outlook of the working people, Marx's friend and associate.

Estate, a social group with rights and duties enshrined in law and custom (usually inheritable). E. is a form of class distinctions in the precapitalist society, whose social structure retained a hierarchy of property distinctions.

Everyday (Conventional) Consciousness, people's spontaneous awareness of their interests, by which they are guided in their daily practice

in the habitual spheres of life: social and personal (in production, in daily and family life, in personal relations with other people).

Exploitation, uncompensated appropriation of the products turned out by the suplus-labour and sometimes even by a part of the necessary labour of the immediate producers by the class that owns the means of production. E. is intrinsic to all socio-economic formations resting on private property in the means of production (slaveholding, feudal and capitalist).

F

Faith, a world outlook in which events, theories and statements (including religious ideas of being, deities) are accepted as true and valid without any proof. F. is the opposite of knowledge.

Fascism, a political trend which emerged in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism and which expresses the interests of the most reactionary forces. F. in power is an openly terrorist dictatorship. Fascist ideology is based on chauvinism, anti-communism and racism.

Fatalism, a belief that events and the course of world development are fixed in advance and that human beings are powerless to change them.

Fetishism, the process of attributing supernatural properties to products of labour, which derives from a reification of social relations (when these are seen as material things) and a personification of things. That process, which is characteristic of the commodity-capitalist mode of production, means that the social and cultural functions of a thing are seen as its natural properties.

Feudalism, an antagonistic-class socio-economic formation which marks a definite historical stage in the society's development from slavery to capitalism. F. is largely based on the natural (subsistence) economy, oriented towards the simple reproduction of the material values necessary for life, a self-satisfaction of basic requirements, and the individual's close ties with the group. Land is in the property of the feudal lords (the ruling class under F.), who have unlimited power over the economically dependent peasants. The latter's labour is the source of the enrichment of the feudal lords.

Feuerbach, Ludwig (1804-1872), German materialist philosopher and atheist, whose views were one of the theoretical sources of the philosophical doctrine of Marx and Engels.

Fideism, a doctrine which puts faith above scientifically validated knowledge, closing ranks with idealism and religion.

Freedom, man's ability to act in accordance with his own goals and interests, on the strength of his experience in the cognition of objective necessity.

French Materialism, an ideological and philosophical movement connected with the development of materialist thought and world outlook among the progressive section of the French bourgeoisie. F. M. served to enlighten broad strata of the society in the 18th century. The philosophical views of Denis Diderot, Claude Adrien Helvetius, Julien Offroy de la Mettrie, Paul Henri Dietrich Holbach and other representatives

of F. M. were elaborated in the context of the natural sciences, ethics and atheism.

Freudo-Marxism, a trend in philosophy and sociology whose representatives lay claim to a synthesis of Freudian anthropological conceptions with the principles of the Marxist dialectics of social analysis.

Fundamental Question of Philosophy, the question about the relation of thought to being, of the ideal to the material, to nature. F. Q. P. calls for an answer to: (1) what is primary—matter or consciousness, and (2) whether consciousness can correctly reflect and cognise the world.

G

Gens, a group of blood relatives who trace their descent either through the maternal or the paternal line, regard themselves as having a common ancestor, and bear a common (gentile) name. As a form of historical community, G. precedes the tribal social organisation.

Geopolitics, a reactionary trend in bourgeois political thought based on an exaggeration of the role of geographical factors in social life. G. serves to spread the ideas of racial inequality, insufficiency of Lebensraum (living space), etc., which are used to justify the aggressive foreign policy of imperialist states.

H

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831), leading representative of classical German philosophy, objective idealist who developed the system of idealist dialectics.

Historicism, the principle of studying social phenomena in the light of their origin and development in a given society, in the context of definite periods of the socio-historical process.

History, (1) the development of nature and the society; (2) a science studying mankind's past, and also the experience accumulated by people in different fields of knowledge.

I

Idea, the supreme form of the cognition of reality, reflecting the object being studied and aimed at its transformation.

Idealism, a philosophical trend which regards spirit, thought and consciousness as primary, and being, nature and matter as secondary in answering the basic question of philosophy (the question about the relation of being to consciousness).

Ideological Relations, all the relations existing in such spheres of social life as politics, religion, morality, law, philosophy and art. I. R. are realised through a system of views connected with each of these spheres, and also through government measures, party activity, legal and other norms, and so on.

Ideology, a system of views and ideas through which people comprehend and assess human relations, the relations of social classes to reality and to each other, social problems and conflicts, and which contain

programmes and goals of political activity aimed at preserving or restructuring the existing social relations, at their transformation and development.

Image, Artistic, a mode of the reflection and mastery of reality in art (literature, music, architecture, etc.).

Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism, characterised by the emergence of monopoly associations exercising control both on the scale of the national and the international market. I. is closely connected with colonialism and the arms race; it creates the economic prerequisites for the society's revolutionary transition to socialism.

Individual, a single human being as a representative of the human race (see *Personality*).

Individualism, a moral and world-outlook orientation contrasting the individual's interests and requirements with those of the society, and serving to justify anarchism and nihilism.

Intelligentsia, a social group of people professionally engaged in mental work which requires special training. The I. has no independent status within the system of social production and cannot be called a class.

K

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804), founder of classical German idealism.

Knowledge, a result of the cognitive process conditioned by historical and social practice, a reflection of reality in the human consciousness in the form of definite notions, judgements, concepts and theories.

L

Labour, "the everlasting Nature-imposed condition of human existence" (Karl Marx, *Capital,* Vol. I, p. 179), purposeful human activity aimed at mastering nature and using its resources to meet vital human requirements.

Labriola, Antonio (1843-1904), Italian philosopher and writer, who propounded the materialist understanding of history elaborated by Marx and Engels.

Lafargue, Paul (1842-1911), French disciple of Marx, who did much to elaborate the problems of the materialist view of history, political economy, literary criticism and linguistics.

Law, (1) the whole body of norms and rules of human behaviour prescribed or sanctioned by the state, the legalised will of the ruling class. L. embraces diverse spheres of social life. As a form of the organisation of social relations, L. is in a state of constant development. (2) An objective, necessary, recurrent and stable connection between phenomena in the nature and the society, which determines the sequence, the order of their change (see *Social Uniformity*).

Legal Consciousness, all the ideas and views which express the attitude of individuals, social groups and classes to law, legality and the existing system of justice, their notions about what is lawful and unlawful.

Legal Ideology, a system of the legal ideas and views of a given

class as recorded in legal theories and legislative documents, which reflect definite legal norms and relations.

"Legal Marxism", an ideologico-political trend among the Russian bourgeois intelligentsia (late 19th and early 20th centuries). Laying claim to a "Marxist" critique of Narodism, the "legal Marxists" repudiated the proletariat's class struggle and socialist revolution.

Legal Relations, all social relations regulated by law.

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich (1870-1924), founder of the Soviet state in Russia, organiser and leader of the CPSU and the international working-class and communist movement, brilliant Marxist thinker and theorist. He upheld and developed the Marxist doctrine in the new historical conditions, brought out the uniformities of the imperialist stage in the development of capitalism, and elaborated the theory of socialist revolution.

M

Machism, a subjective-idealist trend in philosophy (late 19th and early 20th centuries) deriving from the empirio-criticism of Ernst Mach.

Man, a human being characterised by language, thought and consciousness; the subject of conscious activity, in the course of which M. is both a prerequisite and a product of history. According to Marx, "the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations" (see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "The Theses on Feuerbach", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 6.)

Manipulation (Brainwashing), a system of methods for exerting a spiritual-psychological and ideological influence on human consciousness through the mass media in order to subordinate the working masses to the moral values and way of life that are acceptable to the ruling classes of an antagonistic society, which seek to strengthen its foundation by implanting conformism, the consumer mentality and anticommunism.

Marcuse, Herbert (1898-1979), American sociologist, ideologue of the left-radical movement, theorist of Freudo-Marxism.

Marx, Karl, (1818-1883), brilliant theorist and great proletarian revolutionary, founder of dialectical and historical materialism, scientific political economy and the theory of scientific communism, organiser and leader of the earliest international organisations of the working class.

Marxism (after Karl Marx, the founder of the theory), philosophical, sociological and politico-economic theory, the truly scientific world outlook and international ideology of the proletariat, the most revolutionary class. M. includes three interrelated components: dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and scientific communism. It is a doctrine about the main development laws of nature and the society, the laws of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism, about the victory of socialism and the building of a communist society. In the 20th century, Marxism was developed by Lenin (see *Marxism-Leninism*).

Marxism-Leninism, a scientific system of philosophical, economic, social and political views elaborated by Marx, Engels and Lenin. M. L.

is the world outlook of progressive social classes, a theory of the cognition of the world, the development laws of nature, the society and human thought. It provides a theoretical basis for the reconstruction of the present-day world.

Mass Consciousness, collective consciousness in the form of everyday consciousness and various ideological notions which manifest themselves through the psychology of different social groups, classes and strata of a society (serving as a prerequisite and an inducement to their activity).

Mass Culture, a concept denoting the state of bourgeois culture under capitalism in the 20th century. M. C. is marked by wide use of the mass media, an industrial-commercial type of production and distribution of standardised spiritual values (books, music, etc.). Under state-monopoly capitalism, the spread of M. C. involves ever greater manipulation of the consciousness of the masses.

Materialism, a philosophical trend which maintains that the world is a material, objectively existing reality, cognisable and reflected in the consciousness.

Materialist Understanding of History, see *Historical Materialism.*

Matriarchy, a form of social organisation in the primitive-communal system in which descent was traced through the female line and where the woman played the leading role in economic and social life.

Matter, a philosophical category denoting objective reality given to man in his sensations, reflected by these sensations and existing outside and independently of these.

Means of Production, all the means of labour and objects of labour used by people in the production of material values.

Method, a mode of human theoretical and practical activity aimed at the cognition of natural and social phenomena. In philosophy, M. is the way in which a system of philosophical knowledge is constructed and substantiated. Materialist dialectics is the universal M. of the cognition of reality.

Methodology, a doctrine of the principles, forms and methods of scientific cognition.

Mode of Production, a historically distinct stage of production connected with a definite mode of people's joint labour activity, with definite historical forms and relations of their social life.

Monarchy, a form of government in exploiter states under which supreme state power is vested in a single ruler, a hereditary monarch.

Motives, ideals, requirements and tenets prompting the subject to action (individuals, whole groups and classes).

Myth (ideological), false and distorted views and notions about various aspects of real life invented by ideologues of present-day capitalism.

N

Narodism (in Russia), an ideological trend of petty-bourgeois peasant democracy (late 19th and early 20th centuries) which propounded liberal programmes of "national socialism", including those aimed to

offset the influence of Marxism. N. was deeply criticised and invalidated by Lenin.

Nation, a historical form of human community marked by a steady community of economic life, language, territory and national character, which manifests itself in the specifics of its culture and everyday life. As a socio-historical phenomenon, N. emerges in the period of transition from feudal seclusion and fragmentation to capitalism, which strengthens economic and political ties within the country.

National Question, the question about the ways and means of eliminating any of the capitalist forms of inequality between peoples, putting an end to national oppression, and asserting equitable relations between peoples and nations.

Nationalism, the ideology, policy and psychology of the bourgeoisie in the national question. N. is expressed in the notions about the national exclusiveness of some peoples and their superiority over others, national seclusion, hostility and enmity between peoples and nations.

Nationality, a historical form of community marked by common territory, language, culture and mentality, entrenched in the customs and traditions that regulate relations between its members. This form of community is determined by the economic structure of the slaveholding and feudal societies.

Naturalism, the principle of explaining the social world and its development of the strength of natural uniformities. N. exaggerates the importance of the "natural" prerequisites of social life and underestimates the role of the human consciousness.

Nature, (1) in the broad sense of the word, the whole world in the diversity of its forms; that which in philosophy is called "matter"; (2) all the natural conditions of the existence of the human society; the material conditions of human life.

Neocolonialism, a system of dependent economic and political relations being imposed by the imperialist states on sovereign countries. N. is a modernised form of colonialism, and combines direct and indirect methods of economic, political, ideological and military expansion in Asian, African and Latin American countries (see *Colonialism, Colonial System*).

Neo-Freudianism, a trend in non-Marxist philosophy and sociology propounding psychoanalytical (known as Freudian after Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis) notions. N. accentuates the irrational prerequisites for human activity, explaining social processes on the strength of the conceptions of unconscious inclinations which motivate the activities of individuals and social groups in the course of their interaction.

Neo-Kantianism, a non-Marxist philosophical trend of the late 19th and the first third of the 20th century advocating a "return" to Kant, whose doctrine is interpreted from an extremely one-sided idealistic angle.

"Neo-Marxism", a trend in Western social thought (1920s-1980s) seeking to revise Marxism on the basis of an eclectic combination of petty-bourgeois conceptions of revolution, neo-Hegelianism, neo-Freudianism, anarcho-radicalism, "left" existentialism, structuralism, etc. N. in-

terprets the crisis phenomena of capitalism from a vulgar sociological stand, either rejecting or sharply criticising from the "left" the fundamental propositions and conclusions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of revolution and the achievements of existing socialism.

O

Objectivism, (1) a world outlook which denies a concrete historical analysis of social life and lays claim to a "neutral", classless approach to the study of the society; (2) the view that historical development is "impersonal" and "spontaneous", and is beyond the control of human will and consciousness, a view that is characteristic of vulgar economism and similar trends.

Opportunism, a conciliatory trend within the working-class movement which is hostile to the class interests of the working people and which advocates collaboration with the bourgeoisie and a renunciation of the struggle for a socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism.

P

Paris Commune, the first government set up by the people (historically, the first form of the dictatorship of the proletariat) in the course of the French revolution of 1871. The experience of the Paris Commune was elaborated in the Marxist doctrine of proletarian dictatorship (see *Dictatorship of the Proletariat*).

Partisanship (in philosophy and sociology), an ideological and world-outlook orientation expressing the interests of various social groups and classes and manifesting itself through certain leanings and tendencies in the assessment of social phenomena.

Patriarchy, a form of social organisation in the era of the disintegration of the primitive-communal system that came to replace matriarchy. Descent under P. was traced through the male line, and men played the leading role in family, economic and social life.

People, a concrete historical concept, the part of the population (a totality of definite classes and social groups) that is the main motive force of historical transformations, promoting them and playing the decisive role in them. P. is primarily the working masses, who create material values and promote the society's development. Alongside with these, the concept of P. can include other groups and strata which come out together with the working people for progressive social transformations.

People's Democracy, a form of political organisation in the society that emerged as revolutionary democratic power after the victory of people's democratic revolutions (in a number of Asian and European countries). With the development of people's democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions, P.D. turned into a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a multiparty basis, uniting all progressive mass parties and organisations, often in a national front (see *Dictatorship of the Proletariat).*

Period of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism, a special historical period of the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist society into a socialist one. It starts with the establishment of state power by the working class and ends with the building of a socialist society.

Personalism, a trend in religious-idealist philosophy which sees the personality as the primary reality of the world, and the world itself as the creation of god, the "supreme personality".

Personality, man as the subject of definite social relations and activity (i.e., as a member of a definite community of people).

Petty Bourgeoisie, a class of small property owners in town and country living exclusively (or largely) by their labour. P.B. occupies an intermediate position between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the basic classes of the capitalist society.

Phenomenological Sociology, a theoretical trend in non-Marxist sociology which regards the society as a phenomenon that is being constantly recreated by an interaction of the consciousnesses of individuals, that is, solely as a process of their spiritual being. P.S. denies the objective existence of social structures, identifying the structures of interaction between individuals with the latter's notions about these.

Phenomenology, an idealist philosophical trend which, seeking to overcome naturalism in the explanation of the real world and cognition, absolutised the activity of the human consciousness and ended up with subjectivism.

Philosophy, a system of the most general ideas about the world and man's place in it, the theoretical basis of the world outlook. As a special form of social consciousness, P. exists and develops in close connection with changes in the conditions of human life, as a reflection of social being.

Philosophy of Culture, a non-Marxist philosophical trend (first half of the 20th century) connected with an analysis of the essence and significance of culture as a historical and social phenomenon.

Philosophy of History, a field of philosophical research which studies the meaning and laws of history.

Philosophy of Identity, a philosophical conception maintaining the identity of being and consciousness, which served as a basis for Hegel's system of objective idealism.

Philosophy of Life, a subjective-idealist trend of non-Marxist philosophy in the first third of the 20th century oriented towards an irrationalistic interpretation of various problems of man and the surrounding world from the standpoint of "life" (in contrast to reason) as an infinite, intuitive and "creative" principle.

Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich (1856-1918), Russian Marxist philosopher and prominent figure in the Russian and international working-class movement; after 1903, he adopted a Menshevist stand.

Political Consciousness, the political awareness of social subjects (individuals, groups, classes, etc.), a form of social consciousness. P.C. is a totality of political and social knowledge and assessments.

Political Economy, a science of the laws governing the society's eco-

nomic life (production, exchange, distribution and consumption of material values) at different stages of its historical development. Classical bourgeois P.E. discovered a number of "natural" laws of capitalism, but was unable to show their transient character and did not see any class struggle in the society. Marxist P.E. gave a historico-materialist explanation of these laws, putting the discipline on a scientific basis.

Political Ideology, a system of theoretically substantiated (in the form of theories, doctrines, etc.) notions of a class expressing its views on the political organisation of the society, the forms of state, the relations between groups and classes within the state, their place in the society, and the state's relations with other states.

Political Party, the supreme form of the organisation of a class (its most active section or stratum), expressing its interests and guiding it in the attainment of definite goals and ideals.

Political Regime, a system of the methods used in exercising state power.

Political System (of the society), a system of state and non-state social institutions performing definite political functions. Its main elements are the state, parties, trade unions, and other public organisations.

Politics, a sphere of activity connected with relations between classes, nations and other social entities, pivoted on the question of state power, on how to win, retain and use that power.

Populism, pseudo-popular ideological and political trends (both right-wing and pseudo-revolutionary left-wing) advocating the slogans of democratism and non-Marxist socialism. Addressed to "the people" and their "vital interests", these trends are being vigorously used for demagogic purposes by bourgeois ideologues and politicians.

Positivism, a philosophical trend which maintains that true ("positive") knowledge can only be gained through a synthesis of the data obtained from various experimental sciences, without any special world-outlook guide.

Post-industrialism, the conception of a post-industrial society in which non-Marxist sociologists (Daniel Bell, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Alvin Toffler and others) contrast capitalism and socialism with a new type of social system which allegedly puts an end to the relations of property in the means of production and to class distinctions, and where technology and the STR become the key factor of development. An important role in that society is assigned to the sphere of the services, science and education. P. is a modernised ideal of the capitalist society.

Power, an ability to exercise one's will and influence human activity and behaviour with the help of certain means (authority, legal and other norms, coercion, etc.). There are different types (economic, political, social) and forms of P. depending on the sphere of its influence and the conditions of its emergence. In antagonistic-class societies, P. rests on domination by the class that owns the means of production and the subordination to it of other classes. Under socialism, P. is characterised by genuine democracy of the whole people.

Practice, man's multifaceted and purposeful activity aimed at mas-

tering and transforming natural and social objects. P. is the motive force in the development of the society and cognition.

Primitive-Communal System, the first socio-economic stage in mankind's development, which existed from the emergence of man as a human being to the appearance of a class society. The main element of the primitive-communal system was the gentile (maternal, and then paternal and village) commune. That system was characterised by common property in the means of production, a low level of the productive forces, of the division of labour and consumption. The development of the productive forces and social division of labour gave rise to private property, which led to the disintegration of the primitive-communal system and to a class society.

Production, a process of joint human labour whose purpose is to transform nature, maintain and reproduce human life, and create the material values necessary for the society's existence.

Proletarian Internationalism, the principle of international solidarity, mutual assistance and joint action by the working people in their struggle for common goals connected with a radical transformation of the world and mankind's advance along the road of social progress.

Property, the mode of appropriation by people of the means of production, the results of production activity and other material values. P. means definite relations of production between people, as expressed through their relations to things. There are two main types of P.: private P. (under which the means of production are in the hands of a minute section of the society) and social P. (their collective and equitable appropriation by all members of the society).

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865), French petty-bourgeois economist and sociologist, one of the founders of anarchism.

Providentialism, a theistic interpretation of history as predetermined by god (providence), which goes back to medieval religious scholastics in the tradition of St. Augustine.

R

Racism, all unscientific conceptions alleging the mental and physical inferiority of some races (nationalities, peoples) as compared with others, that is, claiming a "natural" division of human beings into higher and lower races and its decisive influence on the development of culture and history.

Rationalism, a philosophical trend that regards reason as the basis of human cognition and behaviour. R. was substantiated by classical German philosophy.

Reform (social), a change in some aspect of social life (institution, establishment, etc.), an innovation that does not destroy the basis of the existing social order.

Reformism, a political trend in the working-class movement which is opposed to class struggle and to socialist revolution and wants to change the capitalist society through reforms on the basis of class collaboration within the framework of the existing system. Any reformist theories

are pivoted on non-acceptance of the idea of revolution, on its rejection.

Relations of Production, all the material economic relations that take shape between people in the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of the means of subsistence. These relations are based on the form of property, i.e., people's relation to the means of production.

Religion, a system of notions, feelings and actions expressing people's faith in the supernatural. R. is a fantastic, distorted reflection in people's minds of the real (natural and social) forces that control their daily life, a reflection in which these forces assume the form of unearthly, supernatural forces.

Religious Consciousness, a form of social consciousness in which the phenomena of real life are given a fantastic, illusory reflection.

Religious Ideology, a totality of ideas about god, the world as a whole, nature, the society and man being developed by theologians and religious philosophers. R.I. takes the form of a conception laying claim to a harmonious explanation of the world, whereas in actual fact that explanation is internally contradictory, illusory and fantastic.

Renewal of Culture, development of cultural institutions, norms and traditions in the course of which these undergo a reconstruction, change and qualitative evolution.

Republic, a form of government under which all the supreme organs of state power are either elected or formed by representative (national) institutions (parliaments), and the citizens enjoy personal and political rights.

Revisionism, a review of Marxist-Leninist propositions under the influence of reformism (right R.) or anarchism and voluntarism ("left" R.), which emerged as an opportunist trend in the working-class movement of the late 19th century, spreading to the social-democratic and the communist movement. Right R. denies the revolutionary role of the working class under present-day capitalism and advocates "pluralism" in Marxism, while "left" R. fuels extremist trends.

Revolution, the mode of transition from a historically obsolete formation to a more progressive one, a radical turning-point in the system of the society's economic, social, ideological and other relations.

S

Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph (1775-1854), objective idealist, representative of classical German philosophy.

Science, a field of human activity aimed at obtaining knowledge about reality and at a theoretical synthesis of such knowledge. As a form of social consciousness, S. reflects diverse aspects of reality and evaluates these on the strength of the results of special research.

Scientific Administration of the Society, an administrative process involving the use of scientific knowledge about the objective laws of development intrinsic to a given society and their conscious application in the interests of all its members, for the benefit of social progress.

Scientific and Technical Revolution, a qualitative transformation of

the productive forces with the conversion of science into a crucial factor in the development of production, into a direct productive force.

Scientific Communism, one of the components of Marxism-Leninism which gives a theoretical substantiation and brings out in a consistent way the forms and uniformities of the working people's struggle for their rights, the revolutionary transformation of the bourgeois society, and the building of socialism and communism.

Scientism, a world outlook which exaggerates the importance of scientific knowledge as the main condition of man's orientation in the world. Absolutising the methods and results of cognition in the natural sciences, the advocates of S. seek to apply these to the social sciences.

Self-consciousness (of an individual), man's assessment of his world outlook, interests and behaviour motives, an integral assessment of his own self. The individual's S. is socially conditioned and is the starting point of his attitude to the surrounding world.

Slaveholding System, the first antagonistic-class formation in mankind's history, which emerged as a result of the disintegration of the primitive-communal system. S. S. rested on the institution of slavery; its basic classes were slaves and slave-owners.

Small Group, a type of social group whose members are in direct personal contact with each other and which is marked by definite emotional relations connected with specific values and norms of behaviour, refracted in a peculiar way through social (including class) relations.

Social Action, the activity of people as subjects of social relations in the context of definite historical conditions. S. A. is a mode of resolution of social problems and contradictions based on a clash between the interests and requirements of the main social forces of a society.

Social Being, the objective (independent of consciousness) process of human life and activity in the society, connected with the production (and reproduction) of the objects and conditions without which human life itself would be impossible. S. B. is determined by the relations into which people enter in the process of the production of material values (see *Social Consciousness, Fundamental Question of Philosophy*).

Social Classes, big groups of people distinguished by their place in the society's system of social production, their relation (often enshrined in law) to the means of production, their role in the social division of labour, and by the mode of acquiring and the dimensions of the share of social wealth at their disposal. In an antagonistic society, classes, as Lenin put it, "are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421). The society's division into classes (just as its intra-class differentiation) is connected with the historically transient forms of the division of labour and the relations of property in the means of production.

Social Consciousness, a reflection of social being in human consciousness determined by the objective conditions of social being. S. C. is the spiritual aspect of social being and exists in the form of views, ideas, and

notions connected with man's theoretical and practical mastery of the surrounding world, with a transformation of reality (see *Social Being, Fundamental Question of Philosophy*).

Social Group, an association of people based on their joint involvement in definite types of activity, a community of relations, ideals, interests, goals, pursuits, and so on.

Social Institution, an element of the social structure, a historical form of the organisation of social life and its regulation. S. I. regulates relations between people and so ensures social stability. S. Is. include definite establishments, social norms, and cultural patterns which determine steady forms of human behaviour. In a class society, S. Is. are of a class character.

Social Interaction, (1) mutual influence of social phenomena within the framework of one and the same process of social life; (2) intercourse between people as social subjects effected through typified (and often depersonalised) forms peculiar to a certain level of intercourse and regulated by a system of social norms and value orientations.

Social Interest, actual requirements as a cause of social actions and events lying at the root of the immediate motives, ideas, thoughts and other inducements of the individuals, social groups and classes involved in these actions and events.

Social Norms, rules and models of behaviour generally recognised in a given society. S. N. help to adjust and regulate social interaction between individuals and groups. S. N. are historically changeable. Class societies are usually marked by a coexistence of different systems of S. N. (morality, etc.).

Social Philosophy, a philosophical analysis of social life, an examination of its most general conditions and uniformities.

Social Relations, diverse connections that take shape between separate groups, classes and nations, and also within these in the process of economic, political and social activity of their members, who are the subjects of these relations.

Social Revolution, a radical transformation of the society's socio-economic structure as a result of class struggle.

Social Stratum, a social group which lacks some of the features of a class and occupies an intermediate position in the socio-class structure of the society.

Social Structure, the whole body of connections and relations existing in a society and determined by the character of the division of labour, social institutions, and relations between classes in that society.

Social System, a system of social and political (state) organisation characterised by definite economic-production and ideological (superstructural) relations.

Social Theory, a set of ideas, views and conceptions used to study social reality as a whole or any of its aspects in connection with other phenomena of the society's life. S. T. examines the problems of the society as an integral social organism in the unity of the various aspects of its functioning and development.

Social Type (of individual), an individual possessing definite proper-

ties characteristic of a specific community (group, class, nation, stratum, estate, etc.).

Social Uniformity (regularity), a totality of interrelated laws, an objective, recurrent and essential connection between social phenomena and between separate stages of the historical process, characterising the society's progressive development.

Socialism, (1) the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation. S. arises as the result of a triumphant socialist revolution, which puts an end to the domination of private property in the means of production and to man's exploitation of man; (2) scientific S., a component part of Marxism, the theory developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, which substantiates the historical inevitability of the communist formation and the principles and ways of its construction.

Socialist Democracy, a form of state power that takes shape as the result of a socialist revolution and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship (which make it possible to involve broad strata of the working people in running the society and the affairs of state), people's power based on the real economic and political equality of all citizens.

Socialist Revolution, the highest type of social revolution which marks the transition from an antagonistic to a non-antagonistic socio-economic formation (to the communist formation, whose first phase is socialism). S. R. completes a protracted stage of class struggle under capitalism and creates prerequisites for dismantling its state apparatus, eliminating private property in the means of production, class and national antagonisms, developing the democratic system of social and economic administration and management and building socialism.

Society, a totality of all types of joint human activity. These types of activity historically differ, depending on the socio-economic system, but it is precisely the interaction between them that creates a definite type of social organisation, a definite social set-up. Socio-economic formations are the concrete historical stages of the society's development.

Socio-Economic Formation, the society at a definite historical stage of development with its intrinsic mode of production, economic basis and a corresponding political, ideological and juridical superstructure. Mankind has gone through the primitive-communal, slaveholding, feudal and capitalist socio-economic formations, and is now in the epoch of transition to the communist formation.

Sociology, a discipline studying the functional uniformities of diverse—big and small—social system within the framework of the society as a whole, the laws of its functioning and development.

Soviet Power, a form of the working people's political power (exercised through the Soviets—representative, electoral organs of people's power), which asserted itself in the USSR as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917.

Spencer, Herbert (1820-1903), English philosopher and sociologist, one of the founders of positivism.

State, the main institution of the political system of a class society engaged in administration and the protection of its economic and social

structures. In an antagonistic-class society, S. is a political organisation of the economically predominant class. As an instrument of power, S. is meant to protect the existing order and suppress the resistance of other classes. Its historical forms depend on the form of government (see *Dictatorship of the Proletariat, State of the Whole People*).

State of the Whole People, a form of socialist state, a political organisation of the people guided by the working class. Its purpose is to build a classless communist society with social self-governance.

State-Monopoly Capitalism, a stage of monopoly capitalism marked by a coalescence of capitalist monopolies with the power of the state in order to maintain and strengthen the capitalist system.

Subject, an individual or a social group as the vehicle of material-practical activity and cognition, the source of activity directed at the object.

Subjective Factor (in history), the activity of the subject—the working masses, classes, parties and individuals—aimed at changing and developing (or preserving) the objective social conditions. S. F. includes different levels and forms (political, ideological, etc.) of action by the subject.

Subjectivism, a world outlook that ignores the laws of nature and the society, which are objective and independent of human consciousness, and absolutises the active role of the subject and his consciousness.

Superstructure, the whole body of political, ideological, legal and ethical relations, views and institutions which springs from a definite economic basis, is interconnected with it and exerts an active influence on it.

Survivals, social relations, traditions, customs, norms, standards of behaviour, views and ideas of the past retained under a new social system, at a higher level of economic and social development.

T

Technological Determinism, a non-Marxist conception according to which the level of technological development allegedly determines the type of social set-up, the social structure, level of consumption, and so on. T. D. lies at the root of the conceptions of "industrial" and "post-industrial" societies.

Theory, a system of views and ideas in a definite field of scientific knowledge which seeks to interpret and explain the phenomenon being studied and presents a relatively coherent picture of its connections and relations with other phenomena of reality and of its development uniformities.

Tradition, the socio-historical and cultural legacy of the past preserved in the society and handed down from one generation (group, class) to another in the form of denite institutions, norms, values, customs, and so on.

Tribe, a type of ethnic community and social organisation which emerged in the pre-class society based on ties of kinship between its members.

U

Utopian Socialism, a trend in social thought comprising the doctrines connected with the pre-scientific stage in the development of notions about an ideal social system, a system with full social equality of all its members and without any exploitation of man by man. These doctrines, however, do not point out any real ways leading towards such a society.

V

Values, material and spiritual objects and phenomena capable of meeting certain requirements of an individual, class or the society as a whole and serving as ideals, precepts and goals of human activity.

Voluntarism, (1) an idealist trend which regards will (an ability to choose) as the supreme principle of man's being. The principle of V. was consummated in German idealist philosophy of the 19th century (Arthur Schopenhauer); (2) a subjective-idealist view of history which denies its objective laws and interprets the essence of the historical process in an arbitrary way.

Vulgar Economism, a view of history, which, in contrast to the Marxist view, purges the historical process of conscious human activity as its intrinsic element. V. E. was developed in the conceptions of so-called economic materialism.

W

Working Class, under capitalism—a class of wage-workers who are deprived of the means of production and are obliged to sell their labour-power to the capitalists, spending a sizeable part of their working time in toiling for the latter. It is the main motive force of the society's renewal in the process of its transition from capitalism to socialism and communism. In the socialist countries, the working class together with all the other working people has become the master of the whole social wealth and has emancipated itself from exploitation once and for all.

World Outlook, an integral system of views on the world (nature, the society and thought) which determine the individual's value orientation and activity.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Progress Publishers

will soon publish

RAKITOV, A.,
Historical Knowledge

In this book the author analyses logical structures with the help of which historical reality is described and the connection between historical truth and ideology is revealed. Also discussed are the nature of the philosophy of history and empirical historiography, the modern concepts of science, the scientific status of professional historical knowledge and historical and scientific descriptions. Much space is devoted to the problem of historical conceptualisation. The concepts of historical fact, historical truth, the laws of history, the structure and content of historical time, the specifics of historical explanation and forecasts as well as the interrelationship between historical and natural scientific knowledge are all touched upon. A number of polemical problems are also referred to.

The book is intended for philosophers, sociologists, historians and anyone interested in the philosophical aspects of historical science.

Progress Publishers

put out recently

VLASOVA T.,
Marxist-Leninist Philosophy. A Visual Study-Aid

This book expounds the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist philosophy with the aid of diagrams, charts and other illustrative material. It is intended for those studying the fundamentals of philosophical knowledge.

Study aids put out in English by Progress Publishers, Moscow:

1. **Marxist-Leninist Philosophy.** A Visual Study Aid. 1986. Diagrams, tables, illustrations. Compiled by T. Vlasova
2. Kharis Sabirov, **The ABC of Social and Political Knowledge.** 1986
3. **Communism: Questions and Answers.** Issue 7. 1987
4. V. Kultygin, **Youth and Politics.** 1987

Philosophy and Social Theory: an Introduction to Historical Materialism

This study aid is a philosophical and historico-sociological introduction to the problems of historical materialism, presented in a popular and systematic form. The author traces the emergence and spread of the Marxist theory of social development since the mid-19th century to our day.

He deals with matters relating to the balance between dialectical and historical materialism, shows the basic principles and main categories of Marxist social theory, and criticises anti-Marxist conceptions which distort the scientific achievements of historical materialism.

A glossary of terms used in Marxist philosophical and sociological literature will help the reader to get a better understanding of all the problems of philosophy and social theory considered in the book.

Progress Publishers